

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

MANY signs show that ministers and laymen in the various Protestant Communions are giving a good deal of thought to the problems of public worship. Books, articles, echoes from Retreats, and conversations with individuals leave us in no doubt of this. There is a growing conviction that current methods of worship are too bleak and bare, and too little expressive of what worship ought to be. There is a definite feeling abroad in the minds of thoughtful observers that all is not well with public worship, and that the line of true progress is to discover the causes and to provide a healthy remedy.

Is worship a means, or an end in itself? This is one of many points discussed with great learning and insight by the Rev. D. H. HISLOP, M.A., in his recently published Kerr Lectures, under the title *Our Heritage in Public Worship* (T. & T. Clark; ros. net). Mr. HISLOP reminds us that the tradition of the earlier centuries is clear as to the primacy of worship. Augustine, Bernard, and Aquinas 'but state an accepted truth when they teach that the worship of God comes first in life, and that worship is an end in itself.'

This view runs counter to the commonly accepted opinion that worship is something to be judged by its results. Mr. HISLOP has no wish to set one conception against the other, but he certainly gives his preference to the older way of thinking. Worship, he maintains, is 'an authentic and absolute attitude of the soul to God.' In its essential nature

it is not merely a means of bringing nearer the Kingdom of God, or creating the brotherhood of man. 'It is the final task and privilege of the Church, for it is the offering of praise and adoration from the creature to the Creator, from children to the Eternal Father.' This attitude, however, includes every part of life; the idea of fulfilling God's will grows out of it and belongs to it. 'In order to fulfil her aim in worship the Church must strive for the evangelisation of the world, for the creation of human brotherhood, for the destruction of all oppression, for the discovery of all truth, and for the creation of all beauty that redeems and makes precious mortal life.'

What are the elements which belong to true worship? In part, Mr. HISLOP's lectures are an answer to this question. His method is mainly descriptive and historical. He has obviously a very high appreciation of all the best features of the Roman Mass. Indeed, he goes so far as to say that, when all criticism has been passed, 'the Roman Liturgy remains a monument of liturgical power, the most moving rite and noblest liturgy in Christendom, and a most potent means of leading the soul to the sense of God.' Whereas Roman worship moves round the idea of sacrifice, Eastern worship gives prominence to pictorial drama, especially in connexion with the doctrine of the Incarnation, and Lutheran and Reformed worship emphasizes the thought of the revelation and communication of God's Word. Thus, the distinctive

types are those of sacrifice, the mystery drama, and the oracle. It is obviously Eucharistic worship that commands Mr. HISLOP's deepest sympathies, and it is the limitations of the Reformed Churches in this direction which call for his sharpest criticism. In Scotland, he says, 'the historic structure of worship was sacrificed on the altar of liberty.'

Many readers will find both the diagnosis and the suggested remedies hard to receive. It is certainly with surprise that one finds in Kerr Lectures, and from the pen of a Presbyterian lecturer, full approval of Catholic ideas and practices, including prayers for the departed and the invocation of the saints, the use of the Cross on the Holy Table, of sacred pictures, and of ecclesiastical colours, a commendation of Reservation and of the practice of placing the Elements on the Table during worship as a symbol of God's presence. It should be added that he has no use for actions, gestures, and images simply because they are beautiful, but because they are significant, and the significance for which Mr. HISLOP looks is always doctrinal. His catholicity, moreover, is so wide that it finds a place for the cinema, and he never forgets the importance of silence, free prayer, and of the place of the sermon in public worship.

We ought, in fairness to Mr. HISLOP, to indicate his Eucharistic doctrine. His theory is not one of transubstantiation but of transvaluation. Through the prayer of consecration, 'that is by the Power of the Word and the Action of the Spirit,' the purpose, value, and meaning of the Elements are changed. 'These material things are made by God vehicles of His presence, and although still existing in the world of sense and of time they are transformed to another purpose. They become the instrument of God—the Body of Christ.'

Our quotations will have shown that this is a courageous and challenging book. It is admittedly a book set for the falling and rising up of many; and its effect will be that 'thoughts out of many hearts may be revealed.' Something more, however, than books and discussions is needed if progress is to be made, and perhaps one of the most

pressing needs of the hour is definite experiment. We do not yet know what is the best type of worship for the age, and we can find out only by trial.

It is doubtful if the ordinary course of ministerial life furnishes the best medium for experiments in worship. Nothing is so distracting to congregations, or so provocative, as the well-meant efforts of clergy to provide for their good. The follies of the earlier Tractarian Movement are proof of this, if indeed proof is needed. Cannot the great Protestant Communion make use of Church buildings which for various reasons have served their present purpose, in order to find out new ways of Christian worship? We do not know, but we are confident that the effort is worth the making, and there are many young eager men in the ministry who under wise guidance would rejoice at the opportunity to find out new paths. The leaders of our Churches ought to show more initiative in this matter; their tendency is to rest content with methods which have worked well in the past. Why do they not let the young discover things for us?

We have one caveat to offer. It is useless for Protestants to make liturgical experiments on a basis of Roman theology. This is a task of Sisyphus. It has been tried and it has failed; and it ought to fail, because the place for such worship is the Church of Rome. What Protestant churches need is experiments on the basis of their historic beliefs and on the foundation of New Testament doctrine.

In his admirable little book, *Preface to a Christian Sociology* (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net), the Rev. Cyril E. HUDSON, Hon. Canon of St. Albans, devotes his last chapter to a discussion of 'The Spiritual Resources of Secularism.' He points out that culture has become more and more anthropocentric, and that the rejection of the Christian doctrine of man as a supernatural being, with his origin and destiny in the eternal world, has had the effect not of increasing but of belittling his significance. This has given rise to two movements of a somewhat conflicting nature.

One regards man as trivial and insignificant. This is a note most frequently heard in contemporary literature. Mr. HUDSON finds it in Lytton Strachey's 'debunking' of important historical characters, suggesting, as he does, that they are no better than they should be, and perhaps not as good as we are ourselves! He discovers it (naturally) in Mr. Bertrand Russell, who confesses to being 'a moderately reasonable being in a totally unreasonable scheme,' in Mr. Herbert Read, who says that for him (and many others) 'any devotion to ideal causes was dissipated by the events of 1914-1918,' and in Mr. E. S. P. Haynes, the well-known rationalist, who reaches the depths of pessimism in his admission: 'In 1935 I have had enough of truth, and prefer any illusion in so far as it efficiently veils the cruder facts of life and human nature.'

There are two things in which the younger generation find little comfort. One is the idea of progress, of an automatic and inevitable perfecting of man and society. Tennyson, Swinburne, and Henley held this creed, but it no longer commends itself to their successors. The other is science, at any rate as a guide to life. They cannot build on science, because it is morally indifferent, dealing with phenomena, not with values attaching to them. Science is the builder or the plumber, not the architect. And for that reason all attempts to get scientists *qua* scientists, or scientific bodies, to pronounce on matters of social significance are absurd.

So much for the negative or defeatist idea of man. But there is another idea, the product of the same anthropocentric culture, which is positive and more optimistic. It is embodied in that variety of humanism which commends itself to many to-day as the best substitute for what they believe to be the obsolete and out-worn creed of Christianity. Its most notable representatives are Mr. Julian Huxley and Mr. Walter Lippmann. Both these writers would claim that their systems are 'religious,' even though the thought of God, in any historic or traditional sense of the word, finds no place in them. One of them believes, indeed, that

'we are witnessing the birth of a struggle between the God-religious and the social-religious.'

Professor Huxley believes in knowledge. He is sure that the clever are always the good, that insight into the problem, and knowledge of the instruments available for its solution of themselves guarantee that the problem will be solved. This pathetic faith that a social philosophy provides its own dynamic pervades every page of his writings. He tells us that, as the result of man's greatly increased knowledge, civilized man is now in a position 'in large measure to model the world according to his desires.' It is 'quite certain that science, if it were allowed a free hand, could control the evolution of the human species.'

Very rarely does Mr. Huxley betray the least awareness of humanity's real, and most evident, problem, namely, to decide, amidst a babel of conflicting voices, which of the 'scientists' deserve to be trusted and followed as prophets, and which do not; and also to discover means not only of persuading men but of empowering them. The real problem of the humanist is 'to find an equivalent for the doctrine of Grace.' Occasionally Mr. Huxley glimpses the fact that, though 'we have got a great deal of control over lifeless nature, we have practically no control over human nature.' In a broadcast debate Mr. Huxley was told that to say 'trust science' means nothing, since among them scientists 'represent all possible outlooks, political, social, moral, and religious.' His reply to this was, 'we are getting into rather deep water, are we not?' You could almost hear his deprecating cough.

Mr. Walter Lippmann is more ethical. He puts his trust in goodwill. And if you ask him, How is goodwill to be made operative? How overcome the inertia and the passion and the selfishness which hinder the translation of our good intentions into action? he replies that the wisdom and necessity of goodwill are so obvious that its own momentum, so to speak, is bound to carry it to triumph. The only thing that hinders its progress now is the fact that it is 'entangled with the

premises of theocracy . . . [but] once effect a divorce between morality and orthodox religion, and morality will stand on its own feet and carry humanity along with it.' Morality in his sense of it, and it is a Christian sense, 'must always be the standard of all good men.'

Mr. Lippmann, however, is blind to the fact that many distinguished men, who are as anxious as he is to deliver the world from the superstitions of Christian faith, do not interpret moral idealism as he does. On what grounds are we to prefer Mr. Lippmann's ethical judgments to those of, shall we say, D. H. Lawrence, or Lenin, or Mr. Bertrand Russell, or M. André Gide, or Herr Rosenberg? And even if Mr. Lippmann's particular 'morality,' which is disinterestedness, were inherent in events, even if it were implicit and inevitable, which is more than doubtful, how is it to be made actual in politics, in business, or in sexual relations?

The fact is that incurable romanticists like Mr. Huxley and Mr. Lippmann share a common sentimental blindness to one of the basic facts of human nature—the fact of *sin*, which makes it impossible for a man to raise himself by pulling at his own bootlaces. More fundamental than man's awareness that he needs salvation is the fact that he cannot save himself. In the sphere of government, to which Mr. Lippmann appeals, an observer, fully as acute as Mr. Lippmann and far more realist, says that 'it is clearly impossible to establish an ideal social harmony either within nations or between nations. The world of politics remains a "world of sin," not because any given political strategy is inadequate, but because there is no perfect restraint, either moral or social, for egoistic impulse.'

Finally, the most militant idolatries of the Western world to-day are those which take political forms. It is important that we should understand their attraction, for they represent the most powerful of the 'spiritual resources of secularism.' Why is the modern man prepared to deliver himself, body and soul, to the State? to give it that complete devotion which only the Eternal has the

right to demand? Partly because democracy has failed to give him what he seeks. Partly because he has no other god to worship, and the Totalitarian State is something to believe in. It provides an end, an absolute. It makes men feel that they *count*. It is a secular substitute for Providence. And in view of this the writer concludes that it must be the task of Christian sociology to show that the only sure basis for faith in a providential purpose for humanity is faith in the living, loving, reigning Lord, Jesus Christ.

The name of the Society of Friends was never perhaps held in higher esteem than it is to-day. Their consistency during the War, their labours in the cause of peace, their missions of mercy to stricken peoples, and their activity in every cause for the social welfare of the world have earned for them a reputation second to none.

Yet, like all other religious bodies, they have cause for serious misgiving and searching of heart. With all their activity in social service they seem to themselves to be lacking in something which the early Quakers conspicuously had. In a society which appears to grow steadily more irreligious they find themselves barely able to hold their own. They 'seem to have very little power to bring others into the experience of God's light within' which is their very life, and the spring of all their work.

This is the problem to which William E. WILSON, B.D., addresses himself in the Swarthmore Lecture for 1935, now published under the title of *Our Response to God* (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). It is a problem which faces all the churches and urgently demands solution. The treatment of the subject in this lecture is in the highest degree interesting and helpful. The conclusion reached is briefly this, that the religious experience of the early Quakers was 'attended by a great release of energy and the formation of vastly enhanced personality,' and 'If we have not what they had, it is not because "God's hand is shortened." It must be

that we do not respond to Him in such a way as to receive the divine energy.'

The Early Friends, as is well known, emphasized the doctrine of the Inner Light. They called on men to listen to the voice of God which speaks within, and to find in their own hearts the 'seed of God.' But they were by no means vague mystics. On the contrary, they were definitely and uncompromisingly Christian. Their spiritual experience was firmly based upon the historic revelation of God in Jesus Christ. It may be asked, why, then, did they not lay more stress on the historic revelation? The answer is that they lived in an age of prevailing orthodoxy, when the doctrines of the Christian faith were generally accepted, but with little experience of the living power of the Spirit. Isaac Penington expressly gives this as the reason why the Quaker testimony took the line it did. They had, he says, no new doctrines to hold forth beyond those held forth in the Holy Scriptures, but they did not think it necessary to preach the historical facts because 'the historical relation concerning Christ is generally believed and received by all sorts that pretend to Christianity. But the knowledge of these (*i.e.* of the historical facts) without the knowledge of the mystery is not sufficient to bring them unto God.'

The circumstances of the present day are different. The historic facts of the faith are not universally accepted, and the emphasis must be shifted to meet the new situation. 'The call of God, then, to our day is obviously not in the first place so much for a re-assertion of what was in the seventeenth century a peculiar contribution of the Society of Friends. . . . But that, in view of the facts of present-day religion and irreligion, our call may be to put a greater emphasis on certain other aspects of Christian truth which in Fox's day were universally recognized and even too exclusively emphasised. In face of modern atheism, is not the call to proclaim the One Living God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, unalterably holy and awe-inspiring, yet near to each one of us, caring for us like a Father, guiding us by His Spirit within, redeeming us from sin and failure and bringing us

into His kingdom? . . . Only as these great Christian facts begin to grip men's thoughts and emotions, does the message of the Light within become clear.'

Now the experience of the saints has been that in Christ they found forgiveness and new life, 'a God-inspired, God-controlled, God-empowered life.' We find essentially the same record in all the great Christian names from St. Paul and downwards. In all alike we see the same fact emerging, that the first essential is to see God in Christ, to hear His voice and surrender completely to His obedience. 'Is it not at least probable that this on a wide scale is the necessary preliminary, both for any effective setting right of the many evils of the world, and for the achievement of that Christian unity for which so many long to-day? Yes, but such outward results, important though they are, do not outweigh the eternal importance of changed lives. There is a strange belief current to-day, which I cannot but think will one day be regarded as a pitiable superstition, that in some way the world in general and its institutions can be set right, while individuals remain self-centred and estranged from God. The truth is rather that only as individuals are changed can society and circumstances become right, and that every life, changed by the power of God, is of eternal significance.'

Many examples of this transforming spiritual change are to be found among ordinary, modern people. The lecturer himself testifies to having recently found 'in the dull and wearying period of middle age, a new release, a new life, a new power.' After recording a number of similar cases which have come under his notice, he finds that amid the greatest diversity of detail all have certain essential features in common. 'Almost all the people I know began, like Fox, with dissatisfaction. . . . Then in all instances there comes, generally through hearing of the change Christ had wrought in some one else, a willingness to give up the fruitless effort to make their own lives right, and instead to give themselves and their problems to Christ. In the common and expressive phrase, "they

surrender to Christ." The immediate result often comes as a great surprise.¹ Doubt of God is no longer possible, victory over besetting sin takes the place of hopeless struggle, and with that there comes a new zest and purpose in life. Many of these people had 'a feeble and non-contagious type of Christianity. But now they have got it in a very intense and highly infectious form.'

To all this it may be objected that here we have something too individualistic. Does it not tend to unhealthy introspection and selfish concentration on one's own spiritual life? Radical change is, of course, to be desired in the case of the openly immoral, but for decent Christian folk who are interested in the Kingdom of God and the social welfare of man, is any such change called for? The answer is threefold. '1. Each life brought into union with Christ represents an eternal gain far outweighing mere better conditions in this life. 2. To be ourselves transformed by Christ is not selfish, but is the way of maximum service for others. 3. If we are to do Christ's work we must follow His method, and that begins within.'

It amounts to this, then, that we have not been seeing things in their true proportions and that we

have been taking hold of our problem by the wrong handle. We have been letting the temporal outweigh the eternal, and we have confused social betterment with salvation. The call of God to us, therefore, is to get back to the evangelistic fervour of the early days. 'The chief cause of our comparative failure is that we have only seldom gone deep enough. Like the Jews of our Lord's day, we have sometimes aimed rather at changing institutions than at changing men. But institutions are what men make them. Jesus Christ began within. We must bring men to Christ that He may change them. It is written of the Early Friends that before changing others they were changed men themselves. Can we overthrow institutions like war, which are strongholds of selfishness, pride, insincerity, and lust, while these or similar sins remain unconquered in us? Our first need is inner cleansing. The first need of those with whom we ally ourselves in these great and desirable projects is inner cleansing. And the first need both of the victims of evil and of those who are responsible for it is also the changed life and the reception of God's gift. We can be willing to be changed and cleansed, but we can do it neither for ourselves nor for others. Only Christ within, who is the power and wisdom of God, can change men.'

Some Outstanding New Testament Problems.

X. The Johannine Sayings of Jesus.

BY THE REVEREND WILBERT F. HOWARD, M.A., D.D., OF THE LAMPLOUGH CHAIR OF NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, HANDSWORTH COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM.

MORE than forty years ago, William Robertson Nicoll wrote to Dr. James Denney: 'Do you lay enough stress on the self-evidencing nature of much—say, the Gospel of John? I distinguish between *testimonium Spiritus Sancti* and this witness. The critics may argue for ever about the authorship of John, but the ordinary man knows that if the discourses in John are not the work of Jesus—then a greater than Jesus is here.'¹

The problem of the Fourth Gospel is far too

¹ *Life and Letters*, by T. H. Darlow, 342.

complex to be settled by one criterion. Nevertheless, some of the theories which until quite recent times seemed to be accepted as beyond dispute left us more baffled than ever. How could an unknown and unnamed genius, without any historical contact with Jesus and His life in Palestine, have succeeded in passing off upon the Church his own thoughts and fancies in the guise of actual discourses by our Lord?

The research of the last fifty years has not settled the question of authorship. That the

Gospel as we have it actually came from the pen of St. John is extremely improbable. Perhaps too much has been made of the question, 'Who wrote the Gospel?' Literary considerations seem to decide that the Gospel as we have it came from the pen of the writer of the Johannine Epistles, and he was evidently a Christian leader of great influence in his own region, which was almost certainly proconsular Asia. The important question is, 'What sources did he use in writing his Gospel?' We cannot doubt that he was familiar with Mark, and there is strong reason for believing that he also used Luke. There are several parallels peculiar to John and Matthew, but some of these are not free from the suspicion of textual assimilation.¹ What other sources did he draw upon, and how far was his information derived from written, how far from oral, tradition? This is the line of inquiry which is likely to prove most fruitful in the immediate future.

Two or three years ago the present writer asked Professor Martin Dibelius, of Heidelberg, what lost writing from the early days of Christianity he would most like to be recovered from the sands of Egypt or from some obscure monastic library. After a moment's hesitation he replied, 'Papias's Expositions of the Dominican Logia, and the Logia used by the author of St. John's Gospel.' The answer is well worthy of consideration. The recovery of the first might remove the common belief that the son of Zebedee could not have contributed anything to the Fourth Gospel. The discovery of the second might illustrate the way in which non-Synoptic sources were available for the Evangelist. A few months ago Dr. Idris Bell's startling announcement led many to hope that a fragment of one of the sources used by our Evangelist had been brought to light. A soberer judgment favours the theory that here we have a writing which proves the early use of the Fourth Gospel as equal in authority to the others, quite a generation before Tatian's *Diatessaron* was written, or the famous argument for the fourfold Gospel was employed by Irenæus.

It is indeed significant that scholars are now beginning to think it possible that the non-Synoptic portions of the Fourth Gospel may go back to traditions which originated in Palestine. Professor Gerhard Kittel² indignantly protests, 'The notion that the Gospel according to John has nothing to do with Palestine has almost the standing of a scientific dogma in German theology.' The sup-

position, encouraged both by tradition and by contents, that it cannot be separated from Asia Minor or Syria, has been taken to mean that any connexion it shows with Judaism must be due not to the Judaism of Palestine, but to that Jewish Hellenism which entered so largely into the religious syncretism of the Hellenistic world. Kittel's contention is that the study of the Fourth Gospel has suffered badly from the lack of first-hand acquaintance with rabbinical literature on the part of its commentators.³

Professor C. H. Dodd, alluding to the recent work done by specialists in this field of study and its bearing on the Johannine problem, wrote in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*: 'The results are striking, and I must confess astonishing to one brought up on the older liberal theories.'⁴

Now let it be acknowledged at once that the Evangelist was facing a situation in which many diverse factors played their part. There were no doubt some who brought into the Church theological speculations from the omnipresent Gnosticism, others who read into the Christian sacraments ideas derived from the mystery cults, others who were familiar with the stock arguments urged in the synagogue against the young and rival sect, others who paid excessive deference to the name of John the Baptist and even asked if he were not the Messiah, whilst others could only accept the Gospel if some of the Hebraic thought-forms were translated into an idiom rather nearer to Platonic idealism. Ever since Dr. E. F. Scott's brilliant book of thirty years ago made clear to the simple reader these subsidiary aims of the Evangelist, certain emphases in the Gospel have been seen to owe their place to dangers which beset the Church at that time and in that region. We may go further and say that sometimes the Evangelist used the religious dialect of his readers in order to correct their errors by sympathetic argument. Does this invalidate the Fourth Gospel as a medium for the transmission of the teaching of Jesus?

We are not now concerned with the chronological outline of the Gospel, or with the debatable question about the historical value of all the episodes. We are not even concerned in this essay with the way in which our Lord's self-revelation is made. There may be an anachronism in the disclosure of the Messiahship from the very beginning of the ministry. Probably the absence of the gradual self-disclosure, which is so impressive a feature of the Marcan portraiture, is responsible

¹ Cf. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 408 ff.

² *Die Probleme des palästinischen Spätjudentums und das Urchristentum*, 45.

³ *Ib.* p. 17.

⁴ xliii. 249.

for the widespread conviction that we must not look to John for any authentic teaching of Jesus. This would not follow, for the substance of the teaching might be authentic, even if the setting owed a good deal to the homiletic use which the Evangelist made of the traditional incidents in the life of Jesus.

The main problems regarding the Johannine record of the teaching of Jesus are (1) its contrast to the Synoptic representation, (2) the relative strength of Jewish and of Hellenistic thought and phraseology in the Gospel, and (3) the extent to which the creative imagination of the Evangelist and the contemporary situation of the Church have determined both the form and the content of the teaching attributed to Jesus.

(1) The contrast between the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics and in John may be summed up briefly in two sentences. (a) The parables, so characteristic of the three earlier Gospels, are entirely absent from John. (b) The Johannine discourses of Jesus are long, and are just like the teaching of the Baptist and that of the Evangelist himself. With regard to (a) it is clear that the Fourth Gospel leaves out entirely one of our Lord's most typical methods of instruction. But it should also be remembered that there is a great contrast between the parables in Mark and Matthew and the stories with a moral which Luke records with such wonderful skill. Are such stories as the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son called in question because there is nothing corresponding to them in the other two Synoptics? The fact is that the teaching of Jesus evidently took different forms on different occasions, and selective interest counts with each of the Evangelists. (b) For a list of brief, aphoristic sayings in the Fourth Gospel, and for parallels between Synoptic sayings of Jesus and those recorded in John, I may perhaps be allowed to refer to what I have written elsewhere.¹ But as the Gospel now stands there is some ground for the suspicion that Jesus, Baptist, and Evangelist all talk in the same strain. If literary style is in question that cannot be denied. But if subject-matter is in mind this needs qualification. Whatever may be thought of some conjectural rearrangements of the text that have been proposed, there is almost unanimous agreement amongst those who have devoted much attention to the subject that the section 3²¹⁻³⁶ should follow immediately after 3¹⁻²¹. This, then, forms part of the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus, and is

not part of the Baptist's testimony. Moreover, the impression that the Evangelist writes as he makes Jesus speak is largely due to the Prologue. But, as we shall see later on, the Prologue, apart from some editorial comments on John the Baptist, consists of a summary from the Logia which the Evangelist has used in writing his Gospel.

(2) The problem of the relation between Jewish and Hellenistic thought and phraseology in the Gospel, which has taken a fresh turn in the Semitic direction within the last few years, falls into two sections. (a) *Linguistic*. As far back as 1902 Professor Adolf Schlatter of Tübingen brought out a little book, *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten*, in which he adduced parallels to the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle of John from the Mekilta and Sifre, which were written in rabbinical Hebrew not long after the date of the Gospel. The alphabetical index of phrases, with the late Hebrew equivalents, is impressive, and Schlatter's own inference was that the Evangelist spoke Aramaic in his early life and only picked up Greek in the course of his missionary travels. Twenty years later Burney's book on the *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* appeared. His theory that the Gospel was written in Aramaic and afterwards translated into Greek led to active discussion. Few scholars have gone all the way with Burney, though such a competent Semitist as Mr. G. R. Driver, while disputing the main thesis, has agreed that Aramaic was probably the language in which the writer of the Gospel thought. He suggests that the Evangelist 'was mentally translating as he wrote logia, handed down by tradition and current in Christian circles in Aramaic, from that language into the Greek in which he was actually composing his Gospel.' Eighteen months ago, Professor C. C. Torrey, in *The Four Gospels: A New Translation*, claimed that all four Gospels were originally written in Aramaic, and he offers a number of instances of retranslation into Aramaic which would account for what he regards as obscurities in the text due to misreading or misunderstanding by the Greek translator. Burney and Torrey by no means agree about the alleged mistranslations, and that is perhaps the weakest part of their argument. But the fact remains that two of the greatest Aramaic experts of the age have been strongly impressed by the Palestinian idiom of the Greek of this Gospel. Now those who have made a special study of the Greek of the Johannine writings are agreed that, with few exceptions, the style of the Gospels and the Epistles is uniform. Yet some Semitic specialists

¹ *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*, 215 ff., 267 ff.

have remarked that though the Greek of the Fourth Gospel lends itself easily to retroversion into Aramaic, the Greek of the Johannine Epistles does not. This leads to a very interesting suggestion. Is the Aramaic idiom equally recognizable behind the Greek throughout the Fourth Gospel? Or is it specially obvious in patches? This is a matter for the Semitist to investigate with great care. If it could be shown that the alleged Semitisms come only in certain sections there would be some cause to suspect that a written Aramaic source was being used. If, however, instances of similarity to Aramaic locutions are evenly distributed throughout the Gospel, then it would not be unreasonable to infer that the writer was drawing on oral tradition which had come to him in Aramaic, and that the whole background of his mind as he framed his Gospel was Semitic and Palestinian in its character.

(b) *Subject-matter.* Here there are three books which have lately brought much material of the greatest importance within the reach of the student. Schlatter's *Der Evangelist Johannes* (1930) is a commentary with ample illustrations from Josephus, Philo, and a wide range of rabbinic literature. Hugo Odeberg's *The Fourth Gospel interpreted in its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents* (Uppsala, 1929) attempts to show (in this first part) what parallels of thought can be found to the discourses in chapters 1-12 in rabbinical theology and even more in other and more mystical elements of Palestinian thought and feeling. This valuable book would be still more reliable if it did not draw upon the Mandæan literature, which is now shown to be almost useless for our purpose. But the greatest of all is that great thesaurus, the Strack-Billerbeck Commentary, the second volume of which contains rabbinic parallels to the Fourth Gospel. To this we must add the parts which have already appeared of *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, and that indispensable work of reference, Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint*. Professor C. H. Dodd's recent book, *The Bible and the Greeks*, illustrates the way in which lexical studies in the LXX may throw light on such a problem as the relative influence of Hebraic or Greek associations when certain words are found in the Fourth Gospel.

What is really wanted is a well-planned and a carefully organized exploration of this whole question, and those who have a sound equipment on the Semitic side must do most of the work under this heading. The urgent need of this kind of investigation is a rebuke to the growing neglect of

Semitic study in our theological curricula! If we seem to have lost sight of our original quest, which is the sayings of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, let it be remembered that unless these sayings are such as can be placed in Palestine, or bear a Semitic stamp upon them, they can hardly be the words of Jesus.

At this point it may be well to recall illustrations which have already been given in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES¹ to show a direct relation between John and rabbinic thought, both in such exegetical uses of the Old Testament as we find in 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day,' and in the more mystical conceptions as 'the Light of the World' and 'I and the Father are one.' All such illustrations, which can be multiplied by a careful search along the lines already indicated, help to remove the prejudice which puts down every mystical note in the Gospel to later and extra-Palestinian influence. We must at the same time remember that there are passages, far fewer and less characteristic, in the Synoptic Gospels which have a mystical flavour. It has been customary to dismiss these as 'Johannine.'² But even Schweitzer interprets Mt 25³¹⁻⁴⁶ in the light of eschatological mysticism, and declares that the ethical meaning of the passage (so obvious to every reader) obtains a special significance through the mystical.³

(3) We have only space to indicate very briefly the way in which the Evangelist sets forth the sayings of Jesus which form the most precious nucleus of his Gospel. The Prologue must be our starting-point, for it is not a programme which the Evangelist sets out to elaborate, but the summary and terse interpretation which he prefixes after writing the Gospel. This, I suggest, is summarized from the Logia which he used. The keyword *Logos* is appropriate to the world into which the finished Gospel is to go. Its very ambiguity gives it a special value when the Gospel appeals to the world of Hellenism. But it comprehends two ideas which the Hebrew words *Hokhma* and *Torah* supplied to the mind of Jesus. Thus the message of Jesus is summarized. Creative Wisdom comes to illuminate men. The world of men is blind, and rejects. A special right to become

¹ xliii. 249 (C. H. Dodd, *Present Tendencies in the Criticism of the Gospels*). See also W. F. Howard, *ut supra* 172 f., 222 ff.

² See T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 110, for a vigorous criticism of this tendency, and for a defence of Mt 11²⁵⁻²⁷, Lk 10²¹⁻²².

³ See *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, Eng. tr., 108.

sons of God is given to those who by birth from God receive Him. The test is faith in what is revealed. Creative Wisdom becomes incarnate in human life. The Divine nature is made visible, in a unique revelation of Fatherhood through Sonship. The Torah was given through Moses: the new Torah—Truth in its gracious appearance—came by Jesus Christ.

One reason why the word Wisdom, so palpably present to the mind of the Evangelist (as to the mind of Jesus according to Mt 11²⁸⁻³²; cf. Eccles 51²³⁻³⁰), is superseded by Logos, is that *Σοφία* was one of the Gnostic watchwords. It is carefully avoided throughout the Gospel, and its place is taken by *ἀλήθεια* at the close of the Prologue and henceforth.¹

The same few main thoughts recur in different settings throughout the Gospel. It is important to remember that these ideas are elaborated in (a) private instruction to discerning disciples, (b) discussions with uninstructed individual questioners, (c) public controversies, (d) instruction to large bodies of disciples, (e) instruction to an inner circle of disciples near the close of the ministry.

The suggestion is here made that the student who is interested in the problem of the Johannine Sayings of Jesus should at this point simply take his Greek Testament, or his R.V. with marginal references, and jot down on sheets of paper an analysis of the main thoughts in all the discourses attributed to Jesus in St. John in the following order:

3¹⁻²¹, 31-36 (Nicodemus); 4¹⁰⁻²⁶ (Woman of Samaria); 6²⁷ⁿ (Synagogue at Capernaum and in private to the disciples); 5¹⁷⁻⁴⁷ 7¹⁵⁻²⁴ (Controversy following healing of paralytic at Bethesda); 8¹²⁻²⁰ (Light of the World, sequel to previous section); 8²¹⁻⁵⁹ (resumption); 9³⁹⁻⁴¹ 10¹⁹⁻²⁹, 30-39 (Controversy following the cure of the man born blind); 12²³⁻⁵⁰ (Discourse after visit of the 'Greeks'); 13¹²⁻³² 15, 16, 13³³⁻³⁸ 14 (Farewell Discourse); 17 (the Prayer).

In this way we can best recognize how often the same leading ideas reappear. Parallel thoughts in the Synoptics should be noticed, as well as relevant references to the Old Testament. To illustrate the method we must content ourselves with the first of these discourses, 3¹⁻²¹, 31-36.

Rebirth necessary to see the kingdom of God.

Birth by water and spirit necessary to enter kingdom of God.

Our testimony is of things seen and heard, but not received.

Failure to believe earthly things prevents faith in heavenly things.

The Son of Man alone has come down from heaven.

The Son of Man must be lifted up, God's only Son, that those believing in Him may have eternal life.

The Son is sent not as Judge, but as Saviour. He who believes in Him is not judged.

Judgment lies in rejection of light in favour of darkness.

He who does truth comes into the light.

He who comes from above, who comes from heaven, is over all.

He testifies of things seen and heard; His testimony is not received.

He who receives this testimony sets his seal to God's truthfulness.

The 'Sent from God' speaks God's words, for God gives not his Spirit by measure.

The Father loves the Son, and has given all things into his hands.

Belief in the Son brings eternal life. Divine wrath rests upon Him who disobeys the Son. He shall not see life.

Any one looking at this analysis must be struck at once by the way in which the discourse begins and ends with the same keynote: 'to see the kingdom of God,' 'to see life.' In a sense this is the bridge between the Synoptic and the Johannine settings of the teaching of Jesus. What the kingdom of God is in one, eternal life is in the other. Yet both terms are found in both traditions.

The Spirit is named near the beginning and the end, and thus prepares the way for the long discourse in the Upper Room at the close of the Gospel with the five sayings about the Paraclete. Here is the unique revelation in the new Torah (that which comes down from heaven, as the old Torah did on Sinai). This gracious revelation of Divine truth, with Sonship as its message, leads on to the Cross, as the means by which eternal life is given. The test for discipleship is recognition of the character of the earthly life and work of Jesus. This points to another similarity and contrast with the Synoptic teaching. The eschatology of the Gospel is already present in this discourse under two keywords—Judgment, which is both present and future, Eternal Life, which is both future and present. These two conceptions are brought together even more closely in the teaching about the Spirit in chapters 14-17.

The sacramentalism of 3⁵ has been explained away on textual grounds by Kirsopp Lake. But in view of the eucharistic language of 6⁵³ it seems likely that the text should stand as it is. Yet

¹ See Strack-Billerbeck, ii. 361 f., and *Theol. Wörterb.* i. s.v. *ἀλήθεια* for the significance of *ἡρᾱ* in Jewish thought.

what a vast difference it makes if that passage is read in the light of the marginal reference, Ezk 36²⁵⁻²⁷! The significance of our Lord's own baptism (according to Mk 1⁹⁻¹²) and the allusion to the well-known passage in Ezekiel make it by no means an improbable saying on the lips of Jesus at a time when the baptism of John must have been the talk of Jerusalem. The antithesis, baptism by water and baptism by the Spirit, is not only Johannine (Jn 1³³) but Synoptic also (Mt 3^{11, 12}, Lk 3¹⁶, Ac 1⁵).

But it is also probable that the saying kept its place in the memory of the Early Church, and was used in the preaching of the Evangelist, to meet the needs of the Christian mission at a time when ideas which originated in the mystery cults were already invading the Church. At this time, too, the saying of Jesus must have undergone a further translation into the idiom of the Hellenistic world. The metaphor of rebirth¹ in this connexion is not Jewish, so far as we know, though in essence the idea is not very different from that expressed in Mt 18².

We should, therefore, say that in this *Baptismal* discourse, based on some sayings of Jesus, the Evangelist has borrowed a contemporary idiom, already current in Christian missionary teaching, even though derived from the religious vocabulary

¹ The 'laver of regeneration' in Tit 3⁵ is generally regarded as a proof of the late date of that Epistle. But the parallel between Jn 1¹³ and Ja 1¹⁶, 1 P 1²³ (two of the most Jewish writings in the N.T.), deserves more attention than it has yet received. See, however, W. Bauer's commentary on John, and H. Windisch's on the Catholic Epistles, in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*.

of Hellenism. His aim is by free translation, expansion, and application, both to conserve and to enforce the emphasis which Jesus laid upon complete spiritual renewal.

In the same way, ch. 6 contains a *Eucharistic* discourse. The symbol, found in the catacombs, of a chalice supporting a fish shows how the story of the feeding of the multitude had been given a eucharistic interpretation in the early days of Christianity. There is one passage in that chapter where we feel that translation has passed beyond equivalence of words into a change of metaphor. In 6⁵³⁻⁵⁶ the phrase 'eating the flesh of the Son of Man and drinking his blood,' however it be interpreted, reminds us of the sacramental terminology which reappears in the Ignatian Epistles and in Justin Martyr rather than of any language which we find in the Synoptic Gospels or anywhere else in the New Testament.² But the purpose of using this very free paraphrase of 'the words of institution' is made clear when we reach the climax of the sermon (6⁶³). 'It is the spirit which giveth life, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life.'

It is becoming unscientific lightly to dismiss the mysticism of the Fourth Gospel as an anachronism upon the lips of Jesus. But much patient work has yet to be done in discovering the sayings of Jesus, spoken in the language of Palestine, which have been sometimes obscured through the transforming medium of the Hellenistic idiom as well as of the targumistic paraphrase of the Johannine Evangelist.

² This subject is discussed with more fullness in the writer's book, *The Fourth Gospel*, 206-14, 265 f.

The Tragedy of the Huguenots.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN A. IRVINE, B.A., ABERDEEN.

THE story of the Huguenots has a charm and fascination about it that few other religious movements of reform have had and withal the note of tragedy. It opened amid romance and closed in agony. It throws light upon the appeal of Protestantism that refutes much clumsy and ill-natured criticism and leaves one pondering sadly, in these desolated years since the War, of what might have been. For I have always felt its defeat to be one

of the mysteries of Providence. It seemed to be so near success, so eminently desirable for France, and yet it failed.

The very name of Marguerite d'Angoulême, sister of Francis I. and Queen of Navarre, the picture of her Court with its alluring beauty and charm, the gathering there of some of France's choicest spirits, her evangelical and mystical piety, the strange discussions and improving conversations

carried on, cast a glamour round the opening story which is sustained by her brave daughter Jeanne d'Albret and her grandson the great champion of the Huguenots, Henry of Navarre, chivalrous, far-seeing, attractive, yet weakening the cause to which his mother had dedicated him by his lax morals and the final betrayal.

Or what could touch the imagination more than to read of the first congregation formed for the baptism of a little child! Principal Lindsay tells how 'before 1555 the Protestants of France had been for the most part solitary Bible students or little companies meeting together for common worship without any organization. Paris set the example. A small company of believers had been accustomed to meet in the lodging of the Sieur de la Ferrière near the Pré-aux-clercs. The birth of a child hastened matters. The father explained that he could not go outside France to seek a pure baptism, and that his conscience would not permit his child to be baptized according to the rites of the Roman Church. After prayer the company resolved to constitute themselves into a church. Jean le Maçon was called to be the minister or pastor, elders and deacons were chosen, and the organization was complete. It seemed as if all Protestant France had been waiting for the signal and organized Churches sprang up everywhere.' 'A little child shall lead them.'

The rise of the Reformation movement in France is intimately bound up with the 'Group of Meaux,' as it was called, whose idea was 'a reformation of the Church, by the Church, in the Church, and with the Church.' Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux, Marguerite, and several scholars were its sponsors, and under Jacques Lefèvre the study of Christ in the Biblical sources was pursued. But these were not the stuff of which martyrs are made and new and daring Churches formed, and it was not until Calvin had framed the great conception of the Church which he began to work out in Geneva that the French Reformation really began.

Meanwhile the ideas of Luther were filtering through, and Zwingli's teaching proving still more acceptable. Even the King wavered, though the moral demands of the reformers were too high for him.

One outstanding feature is the reverse of St. Paul's experience, 'not many noble are called,' for the Huguenot movement was marked by the names of some of the highest families in France. The three brothers of the noble house of Montmorency, François d'Andelot, Odet, Cardinal de Chatillon and Bishop of Beauvais, Gaspard de

Coligny, Admiral of France, with whom its fortunes were to be so closely bound up and to whose guidance it owed so much, joined it. Antony of Navarre and Louis, Duke of Condé, doubtful recruits, were on the same side, while many like Du Plessis-Mornay remained loyal and invaluable through bright and dark days. But the greatest of all was Coligny, and in him one sees what the reformed faith was capable of doing in French life. How he was first drawn from his traditional Romanism is not clear, but the movement became ever more and more manifest until he stands like his great contemporary and friend, William the Silent, in undisputed leadership as soldier, statesman, and Christian.

Other leaders there were, like Antony of Navarre or the Prince of Condé, but selfish scheming and worldly policy mingled with their action. Coligny stood out as the peerless leader, using his great position at Court, his family renown, his military reputation to support the faith of Jesus Christ, as the Reformers saw it, and to plead for a fair field for it in the land that was so dear to him.

So, wherever he was in his apartments at the Palace, when attending Court, or in his Castle at Chatillon, religion was ever the moving principle of his life. Cruel he could be, as were the times and practices of warfare, but all through he bore an unblemished record and his private life was deeply devout and prayerful. This was the man whom the jealousy of Catherine de Medici and the hatred of the Roman Church struck down on that woeful night in August 1572, when the tocsin sounded at the bidding of the feeble and terrified Charles IX., and all Paris and the provinces went mad in their lust for the blood of the finest citizens of France.

For though the rivalry between nobles and the Crown was a factor in ranging the former on the side of Protestantism against the Court faction, yet it cannot be denied that spiritual reasons lay at the foundation of the movement.

The history of Huguenotism falls into four periods. The struggles of the early days from 1555 to 1562; the lamentable Wars of Religion from 1562 to 1589, when Henry of Navarre found Paris worth a mass and surrendered the faith of his mother; the years from his accession, and the promulgation in 1599 of the Edict of Nantes to 1685; and the terrible times that followed the Revocation by Louis XIV. in that year.

The Venetian Ambassador, a shrewd observer, writing home to the chiefs of his state gave it as his opinion that the first War of Religion prevented France from becoming Protestant. Whether he

was right in thinking that there was any chance of Protestantism really winning France may be doubted, but we can well see that when fire and sword were let loose or accepted the dice were loaded against the Huguenots. Once their cause was mixed up with political aims its success was endangered, and it is doubtful in any case whether France would ever have submitted to the moral discipline that the Huguenot faith demanded. On one particular point the royal authority was inevitably and immovably hostile, a point upon which recent events throw light, that is the conception that it was not possible to have real stability where there were two religions. Two Churches in one state were deemed wrong and injurious, and this was felt all the more as the Court dreaded the democratic tendencies of Calvinism.

It is not necessary to wade through the confused and tangled story of the wars. With the victory of Henry of Navarre and his accession to the throne better days for the Huguenot movement commenced. For bitter though the disappointment was, that the son of so true and noble a Protestant as Jeanne d'Albret, the Queen of Navarre, should revert to the old religion, Henry's sympathies were still so much with his former friends, and his understanding of the situation so clear, that the way was paved for a settlement by the famous Edict of Nantes which gave years of religious peace to war-torn France. Defects there were in it of which any monarch hostile to Protestantism might make use and did as time was to show, but meanwhile 'it gave France,' says Professor Grant, 'a splendid period of religious peace during which she assumed the leadership in Europe in culture as well as in war and diplomacy.'

The halcyon period lay between 1630 and 1660. Freed from war and political manœuvring the Huguenots were able to develop their lives and show the stuff of which they were made. Drawn mainly from the middle classes they secured the key positions in finance and industry. Their wealth grew and their influence increased owing largely to their straight, honourable, and conscientious character, for 'honest as a Huguenot' became a saying. Brought up in a hard school, restrained by their own religious principles from many habits that were expensive and degrading, they built up substantial fortunes and found their way into the highest posts, and their intellectual vigour and freedom to utter their views served as a stimulus even to the Catholic Church.

The worship of the Reformed Church was, like its buildings, simple and austere. The sermon

occupied the central place, and the French showed themselves great preachers. Instrumental music was not allowed. The Lord's Supper was observed four times a year, and the congregations were under the charge of the pastors, elders, and deacons.

In conduct the Church was Puritan. Dancing, worldly attire in men or women, the frequenting of taverns were frowned upon. Madame Du Plessis-Mornay was refused admission to Communion by her Pastor until she took certain wires out of her hair. One would like to know how the matter ended, for Madame appealed to Henry of Navarre, whose lady friends were numerous and not Puritan.

But before the end of this period the shadows were gathering and the malign influence of the Roman Church declaring itself. There were loopholes in the Edict, and the Court, with the legal authorities at hand to aid it, was not slow to take advantage of these and interpret the conditions in a way that was favourable to its interests, and was to lead up to 'one of the greatest blunders and crimes in European history,' the Revocation. The situation could not be put better than in Professor Grant's words: 'When Louis xiv. had cast aside the excesses of his early reign and turned to religion with a genuine devotion, the extirpation of heresy seemed to him the best way by which he could show his repentance and his zeal in the service of God.'

'The Church never failed to demand with horrible iteration the curtailing of the liberties of the Huguenots, which seemed to them an insult to their Church and to God. There was no one with the sanity and political instinct of Richelieu to point out the dangers of such a procedure and to recommend the way of peace.'

'It was, above all, to a false idea of unity that the rights of the Huguenots and the prosperity of France were sacrificed. Political and religious ideas here worked hand in hand. As I read the edicts which were issued against the Protestants of France, I am again and again reminded of the treatment of the Jews in Germany of to-day.'

Perhaps Dr. Grant would have been still nearer the mark if he had pointed out the close parallel, as indeed he seems to do elsewhere, between Louis and his churchmen and courtiers with their conviction that a state could not stand part Catholic and part Protestant, and the Nazi demand for absolute unity.

For some time the fact that Marshal Turenne was nominally a Huguenot, coming of a family that had been loyal to the Protestant faith, gave a certain amount of protection against the harsher

measures, for no one stood higher in those days of France's military ascendancy than this great soldier. But in 1678 he passed over to the enemies' camp, as many of the nobles had done, and from then onwards the pressure became more severe and ruthless. Liberties were steadily withdrawn and difficulties increasingly thrown in the path of the Huguenots, while every mark of social inferiority was attached to them and they became almost 'untouchables.' All public employment was closed to them, the right to enter the professions of law and medicine, where their success had aroused jealousy, was taken away, the Protestant judges were removed on the ground that religious animosity was gone—the King had made a solitude and called it peace. The family was attacked, mixed marriages were forbidden, children of tender years were allowed to declare their desire to become Catholic and so removed from their parents' care. The final touch of brutality was given to the situation when soldiers were billeted exclusively upon the Huguenot population, and this passed into the horrors of the dragonnades. No wonder that to the King's joy 'conversions were reported by tens of thousands.'

It was easy now to give the *coup de grâce*. In the Act of Revocation the King said, 'Now we see with thankfulness to God that our cares have had the end we proposed for them since the better and larger part of our subjects of the R.P.R. have embraced Catholicism.' As there were supposed to be none but Catholics left there was no more need for the Edict of Nantes. Swiftly the blows fell and the dark times came on the stricken Church. The soldiers carried on their horrid cruelty, and thousands of hapless Protestants were slain or sent to the galleys.

For many years one and another had been slipping over the border into Germany or across the Channel into England, but now it became a full stream. The frontiers were closely watched, and the tales of the escapes are more wonderful than the wildest fiction. In the years that followed a quarter of a million of the finest and most devoted sons and daughters of France made up their minds to leave their country. Their departure bore results from which France never recovered. The men and women who forsook her shores were the hardest workers, the most skilled operatives, the ablest brains, the soberest and most God-fearing of her people, and they took their gifts and abilities to enrich other and more tolerant lands. France lost soldiers, bankers, financiers, merchants, manufacturers, and these other lands gained them; the

trade balance was soon altered in favour of Britain.

Germany, still bearing the marks of the hideous devastation of the Thirty Years' War, welcomed them with open arms, the ruins of Magdeburg were occupied and rebuilt by them, and Berlin, strange to say, owed the beginning of its greatness to these French exiles. Holland, too, received many of them, and their coming quickened the commercial, agricultural, and intellectual life of the country. Amsterdam especially felt the prosperity in enlarged bounds, increasing revenues and population.

In 1688 with the coming of William of Orange to the throne of Britain the gates were opened to the Huguenot refugees, and one does not need to spend much time pointing out how great was the benefit conferred upon our country by the influx of these exiled Frenchmen. They brought the silk industry to Spitalfields, and the manufacture of wearing materials to many towns of Britain and Ireland. A large contingent fought under their leaders Ruigny and Schomberg at the battle of the Boyne, face to face with the soldiers sent by Louis XIV. to uphold the claims of James II.

To cut out the names of French Huguenot families from the record of the last two hundred and fifty years of British history would leave some unmistakable blanks in politics, in literature, in finance, in religious life. Bosanquet, Cavalier, Cazenove, Chevenix, Courtauld, Durand, Gaussen, Gambier, Gosset, Gillott, Hugessen, Huber, Layard, Lefevre, Lefroy, Ligonier, Martineau, Romaine, Romilly, Thelusson, Trench, are all of Huguenot extraction.

In London there were at one time thirty-five churches, those in Threadneedle Street and Swallow Street being set apart to restore to Church membership any who, under intolerable persecution, had abjured the faith but afterwards under the free sky of England wished to resume their Protestant standing.

Little by little of course these congregations diminished in numbers. When the hope of returning to their beloved France faded, the younger generation made up their minds to link their fortunes finally with Britain. Children grew up familiar with the English tongue and associated in school and play with English boys and girls. They inter-married, sometimes even they dropped their French names, while the services in the plain hard-seated buildings, up closes and in back streets, became distasteful and the Anglican and the Nonconformist Churches gained them.

So France found whole provinces robbed of their

most skilful and industrious workmen, and lost two millions sterling of revenue at a time when fortune was turning against her and the military schemes of her monarch were to bleed her white as the great clash of the wars of Marlborough began. Louis had flattered himself, at the time of the Revolution, that Protestantism was dead. The flight of this host of his best and most valuable subjects to build up the wealth of his enemies was a disillusionment. He had needed the message of Beza to Antony of Navarre, 'struck off in the heat of the moment': 'Sire, it is, I confess, for the Church of God in whose name I speak to endure blows and not to give them. But may it please you to remember it is an anvil which has worn out many hammers.'

Yet great as were the numbers who fled, a substantial and far from negligible minority remained behind to keep the light burning in secret until the day of complete toleration dawned. In some sense the eighteenth century is the most heroic age of all in the chequered history of the Huguenots. When we see how through the years that followed the Revocation up to the days of the Revolution when freedom finally opened before them, these scattered, hunted, despised Christians bore themselves, alone, unaided by outside intervention, in a purely religious movement, we learn how rich with possibilities the French nature has been.

'The Calvinist minority,' says a modern French historian, 'by reason of the purity of its morals, the active intensity of its religious life and its energy of character was truly an élite whose soul had perhaps been made hard and sombre, but had also been finely tempered by the persecutions of a century.'

We are sometimes asked to believe that Protestantism is fitted only for the northern peoples. But the Huguenots were stronger south of the Loire than north, in the Rhone valley than on the Seine. Puritanism is not a product of English or Scotch soil only. It began with a Frenchman,

John Calvin, and showed itself in brave and unforgettable ways in these persecuted Huguenots. That was the strain that Louis had done his best to root out of French national life, and even after his death the ruthless cruelty went on.

Such, then, was the sorrowful way of Huguenotism.

The tragedy of the whole story to my mind lies in the thought of how near France was once to becoming largely a Protestant land. How different the history of Western Europe might have been! Think what Protestantism has lost through the lack of French grace and lucidity and delicacy of touch. Huguenotism had it survived, to the extent which in the early days it had attained, would have imparted a romantic strain to our Protestantism which it somewhat lacks. But to the stability of French political life how much it could have contributed! How fine a gift of serious, clean, moral living it offered which France refused and for the lack of which she has suffered grievously ever since!

'Modern France is equally the result of her rejection of Huguenotism and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. France, indeed, has responded times out of number to the generous appeal of humanity. She has shown less instinct to adopt a new ordering of daily life. And yet this latter is what the acceptance of Calvinism would have entailed. It would have meant much to her, above all the bracing of the moral fibre.' Had this steady, industrious, God-fearing element been allowed to take its place in French life, and to wield its influence, the Revolution might have been passed through as quietly and with as little bloodshed as ours. There might have been no wars of Napoleon with the aftermath they left. Perhaps even 1870 would not have come with a more level-headed people and a people that had more in common with Protestant Germany, and if there had been no 1870 there would have been no 1914.

Literature.

JUDAISM, MEDIEVAL, AND MODERN.

OURS is a commemorative age. If we have not yet developed a true sense of history, we have at least the feeling that the past is really important for us, and that it behoves us to get and to keep a

knowledge of the men and the movements which have made us what we are. Some of the figures whom we thus celebrate may be comparatively insignificant, but there can be no doubt as to the place taken by Moses ben Maimon, whose eight hundredth birthday falls this year. Jews and

others in many parts of the world will recall him, and Dr. Solomon Zeitlin's handy biography—*Maimonides: A Biography* (Bloch Publishing Co., New York; \$2.00)—is a timely production.

Here we can trace the life of Maimonides, from his early days in Spain, through the fanatical kingdom of Morocco to the milder and more liberal atmosphere of Egypt, where he attained wealth, position, and fame. It is not too much to say that he was the most conspicuous figure in mediæval Judaism, and, in spite of the opposition which met him during his lifetime, he probably did more than any other one man during the Christian era to direct and control the later thought of his people. It is not this side of his subject, however, that Professor Zeitlin treats most fully. It is the man himself, seen against the background of his age, who is brought before us. We have an intensely interesting picture of a world almost unknown to most of us, that of the eastern Mediterranean in the age of the Crusades, as seen by a native and not by an invader. We can even watch the rise of Saladin himself, and all the while we are conscious of that Muslim civilization which was already stretching from Spain to India.

Maimonides himself is a less striking and attractive figure than we should have expected him to be in the pages of an enthusiastic biographer. We have an account of what he did and suffered, of his methods of escaping persecution and of the influence he wielded at the Egyptian Court in his later days. His literary works are given due space, and the effect they produced on his contemporaries is noted. But, somehow, we miss the impression of a great personality; Maimonides does not come to life and demand our admiration and our allegiance. Dr. Zeitlin may well have felt that the readers for whom he was more especially writing did not need to be inspired, and lacked only instruction. That, at least, he has given us in abundance, and we have plenty of material from which we may reconstruct the figure of Maimonides for ourselves.

All good sermons seem to show a certain family relationship, no matter what be the particular faith that inspires them. Apart from some conspicuous omissions, the lectures and addresses of Keshab Chandra Sen might well have issued from a Christian pulpit—and not a few Christian sermons would be quite acceptable to the Brahmo Samaj. Jewish sermons, to judge from a recent volume, *The Faith of a Jewish Preacher*, by the Rev. Ephraim Levine, M.A. (Goldston; 8s. 6d. net), not only share the normal character of sermons in

general, but have a quality of their own. Mr. Levine is a minister whose connexion with his present congregation goes back to the days of the War, and he has studied Christian theology probably as thoroughly as most Christian ministers. While maintaining the 'orthodox' Jewish position, he is fully acquainted with the best work done by modern scholars on the Bible, and is prepared to accept critical conclusions where they do not touch the Law. He is steeped in the theological literature of his own faith, ancient and modern; the Talmud is quoted almost as freely as the Bible.

It would be hardly possible, then, to find a better illustration of what Jewish sermons may be at their best. The volume includes a number preached on special occasions in the ecclesiastical calendar, and a small selection of memorial addresses, while half the book is taken up by a series of short essays which appeared originally in the 'Jewish Chronicle,' arranged for every Sabbath in the year. Here the preacher has selected some feature of the lesson for each week, and made it a peg whereon to hang his discourse.

These sermons differ in two ways from what we should normally find in an analogous Christian collection. A good Christian sermon is always, explicitly or implicitly, evangelistic; it makes the reader or hearer want to be a Christian. Mr. Levine helps us to appreciate, admire, and sympathize with the Jews, but we do not want to join them in consequence. This may be due to the second distinctive feature, which is a certain racial and denominational self-consciousness. We have the feeling that the Jew is on the defensive—partly, perhaps, because most of the sermons date from the period of German persecution. His place, function, and witness are emphasized. It is not an inferiority complex which thus finds expression; it is rather a minority consciousness. The same atmosphere may often be sensed in addresses delivered in meetings of the Society of Friends, and it has the same psychological explanation. It detracts in no way from the value of the sermons, and Mr. Levine's volume should be read by all who wish to see modern Judaism at its best. One very curious printer's error may be noted; the text (but not the headings) of pp. 327 and 331 seem to have changed places.

SOME POPULAR BOOKS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Three popular books on the Old Testament have to be noticed. The first is *The Modern Approach*

to the Old Testament, by Mr. Jewett C. Townsend (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). The writer, judged by the internal evidence of the book itself, is an American pastor who feels the need for some popular presentation of the results of modern research on the Old Testament. He divides his work roughly into three parts, of which the first is mainly introductory, the second a description of each book of the Old Testament, and the third a summary of conclusions. The last part is the best; Mr. Townsend seems to be unaware of the great mass of work that has been done during the last twenty years, and is still living in the age of Wellhausen and S. R. Driver. This may in some respects be justifiable, since it is not always wise to present the lay world with untested theories. On the other hand, there are certain definitely ascertained facts—for example, the date of the fall of Nineveh—which might safely have been laid before the unlearned public. We have had in recent years a number of books which we would recommend to the reader for whom Mr. Townsend writes; had he been aware of them, he would have realized that his book was not needed.

By way of contrast we may note a work by an English pastor, *The Prophets of the Bible*, by the Rev. Henry Cook, M.A. (S.C.M.; 5s. net). Mr. Cook is a working minister who found that the prophets interested him, and, through him, his congregation. He has, therefore, printed a series of addresses or lectures given originally to his own people. He makes no claim to scholarship, but he has made a determined and successful effort to keep abreast of the latest developments in Old Testament studies. From many points of view this is exactly the kind of book we want. It has the attractive and impressive style of one who knows by experience the best way in which to transmit his message. It is rich in illustration and in reference to general literature, and there have been few books on the prophets in recent years which could be more seriously recommended to the busy pastor or Sunday-school teacher.

Dr. Eric Waterhouse is editing for the Epworth Press a series of little handbooks on Great Religions of the East. The latest volume in the series is a sketch of *The Religion of the Hebrews*, by Principal C. Ryder Smith, D.D. (2s. 6d. net). Principal Smith is a scholar who is well known for his work on the Old Testament, especially on the social and economic side, and this little volume shows him to be equally competent to deal with the religious aspect of Israel's history. The volume, though necessarily small, yet contains all the salient facts,

treated in every case from an independent point of view. This does not mean that Dr. Smith takes a pride in differing from all other scholars, but that he weighs every item for himself, and does not hesitate to record his opinion, even when that opinion leaves us with an unanswered question. Indeed, one of the features of the book is the way in which he shows us how often a sound conclusion is not to be reached with any certainty on the basis of the available evidence, and it is significant that he is not afraid of an unsolved problem. If Mr. Cook has shown us how a working minister can write a book which will satisfy the scholar, Dr. Smith has shown us how a scholar can write a book which can be understood and valued by a layman.

PROGRESS IN OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES.

Old Testament scholarship in this country has long felt the need of some means whereby its best research work could be made available for the general public. There has been nothing between the full-length book and the magazine article—the one too long and the other too short for the proper exposition of scholarly detail. Messrs. T. & T. Clark are to be congratulated on their new venture, undertaken in conjunction with the Society for Old Testament Study, and especially on the first number of their new series—*The Ras Shamra Tablets: Their Bearing on the Old Testament*, by the Rev. J. W. Jack, M.A., D.D. (3s. net). This is a brief introductory account of the recent discoveries at Ras Shamra, and is the first convenient treatment of the subject that has appeared in English.

It is difficult to see how the work could have been better done. The subject is illustrated by a facsimile of a tablet with transliteration and translation, the alphabet is given, and there is a list of the deities mentioned in those tablets which have been deciphered up to date. Dr. Jack divides his work into six chapters; the first is archæological in the strict sense, the next four deal with the language, the mythology, the ritual, and the history found in the tablets, while the last indicates certain lines along which we may look for help in the interpretation of the Old Testament.

Dr. Jack tells us in his first sentence that these tablets 'are the most important unearthed since the Tell-el-Amarna ones.' For the student of the Old Testament it is unnecessary to make this limita-

tion; they are far more illuminating than the Tell-Amarna documents. They date roughly from the same period, but whereas the Egyptian records give us little more than a background for the Israelite conquest of Palestine, the new texts have something to tell us on practically every side of Old Testament studies. True, the suggestions we receive are sometimes rather startling, and we cannot yet see what the end will be. But of the importance of these documents there can be no doubt. Dr. Jack does not claim to have offered us more than an introduction, and he has whetted our appetite for further knowledge. If subsequent issues of 'Old Testament Studies' maintain the level of the first, the success of the series is assured.

Dr. Jack's work illustrates one of the lines along which advance is being made, the discovery and publication of totally new material. More subtle, more delicate, and, it must be confessed, more open to discussion, is another line, that of the reinterpretation of material which has long been familiar. Much attention has been given in recent years to the cultus practised in pre-exilic Israel, and a few years ago we had a symposium on the subject, edited by Professor S. H. Hooke, under the title 'Myth and Ritual.' This work is absolutely indispensable for any one who wishes to know what progress is being made in Old Testament scholarship, and we warmly welcome a volume in which the subject is carried a stage further—*The Labyrinth*, edited by Professor S. H. Hooke, M.A., B.D. (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net). Professor Hooke has made some changes in his 'team'—in some cases for the better. The opening essay (by C. N. Deedes) bears the title of the book, and is a most interesting study of the labyrinths of many lands; the idea is traced back to Egypt, and is 'the centre of activities connected with those greatest of mysteries, Life and Death.' Father Eric Burrows, S.J., contributes a description of some cosmological patterns, and Dr. A. R. Johnson a discussion of the Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus. This is an extraordinarily brilliant presentation of the writer's hypothesis, and, since it is the only chapter in the book which deals primarily with the Old Testament, it is for many readers the most valuable section. Two other essays handle Jewish subjects—Dr. Oesterley's on the Cult of Sabazios and Dr. Rankin's on the Festival of Hanukkah. Both are full of interest, especially the former, which brings out with startling clearness the possibilities of syncretism, and shows how even Jews could combine with men of other faiths

in producing a composite religion. It may be remarked that there is no section which gains so much from apt illustration as does this. Professor Hooke carries the idea of a myth and ritual pattern into Jewish and Christian apocalyptic, and endeavours to present the subject in such a fashion as to embrace all the subjects treated by his collaborators. Professor James, of Leeds, discusses the Sources of Christian Ritual, with special reference to details of the Mass, many of which he traces back to the ancient types of ritual, and the volume closes with an article by A. M. Hocart on the Life-giving Myth. Mr. Hocart draws largely on Indian sacred literature, though his researches have taken him into many other fields as well, and we feel that his essay might well have stood at the head of the earlier volume. It stresses the connexion between myth and ritual, and, if we may pass a criticism on it, we may say that it gives us just enough information on each point to tantalize us with a desire for fuller light.

As compared with 'Myth and Ritual,' the new book has far less coherence. It is difficult (in spite of the Editor's efforts) to keep a single concept before us as we read it; the different sections do not, for the most part, dovetail into one another. But, regarded as a volume of isolated essays, it is, if anything, an improvement on its predecessor. Certainly the former book contained nothing quite so brilliant as Dr. Johnson's essay, or so illuminating as those of Mr. Deedes and Dr. Oesterley. Taken as a whole, it is a book which must not be missed by any one who wishes to keep abreast of modern studies in comparative religion.

A NEW CRITICAL EDITION OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT.

The greatest gratitude is due to Mr. S. C. E. Legg, A.M., and the committee presided over by the Bishop of Gloucester, for the publication of the first part of *Nouum Testamentum Graece Secundum Textum Westcott-Hortianum: Euangelium Secundum Marcum* (Milford; 21s. net), which is supplied with a new and full critical apparatus. It is a happy choice that the portion now published is the Gospel according to St. Mark, in view of the outstanding critical and textual importance of that Gospel. The new work will take the place of the eighth edition of Tischendorf's Greek Testament, which scholars have used for sixty years in the study of variant readings. In the Latin Preface, which bears the names of the Bishop of Gloucester

and Professor A. Souter, of Aberdeen, generous praise is given to the work of Tischendorf and earlier textual critics, and to the fruitful labours of their successors in more recent years, F. C. Burkitt, Pusey and Gwilliam, G. W. Horner, Wordsworth and White, and R. P. Blake. It is only by the generosity of the Clarendon Press, assisted by gifts from the British Academy, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and many Oxford and Cambridge Colleges that the great undertaking has been made possible, and besides British scholars, German and American experts have placed the fruits of their learning at the Editor's disposal.

The problem of the printed text has been solved, after discussion, by the use of the standard Westcott and Hort text. It would have greatly simplified the *apparatus criticus* if the Textus Receptus had been used, but the course taken not only gives the place of honour to a much more accurate text, but also permits a much fuller display of the textual evidence to be given. Full use has been made of the evidence made available in recent years by the discovery of W, Θ , the Chester Beatty Papyri, and other manuscripts and versions, and fuller and more accurate Patristic quotations are appended. Beautifully printed, and with all the skill and accuracy for which the Clarendon Press is so famous, the new Greek Testament will prove an invaluable and indispensable aid to scholars the world over, and it is much to be desired that, with as little delay as so great a task entails, the remainder of this great work may be completed.

HISTORY AND INTERPRETATION IN THE GOSPELS.

The Bampton Lectures for 1934 were given by Professor R. H. Lightfoot, Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis in the University of Oxford, and have now been published under the title *History and Interpretation in the Gospels* (Hodder & Stoughton; ros. 6d. net). The subject is one of the greatest interest and importance, for it cannot be doubted that the religious beliefs of the primitive Christian communities have left their mark on the form and contents of the Gospels. The burning question of the day is the extent to which the beliefs were operative and the effect of the process on the historical value of these writings. Here was a great theme, to be treated with sympathy, discrimination, and shrewd judgment; and it is to our profound regret that the only one of these

qualities we can find in Professor Lightfoot's book is sympathy.

After a short survey of the history of Gospel Criticism, Professor Lightfoot gives an inadequate account of *Formgeschichte*, based mainly on the work of Dibelius, now accessible to English readers in Professor Lee Woolf's translation ('From Tradition to Gospel') of Dibelius's 'Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums.' Bultmann and K. L. Schmidt are merely mentioned in passing, and no reference at all is made to Albertz, Bertram, and Fascher. The following lectures include studies of the doctrine and content of Mark, and of the Passion-narratives in the Synoptic Gospels. Everywhere Professor Lightfoot is on his guard against what he calls 'the excessive historical value assigned in the last two generations to St. Mark's Gospel.' This, he assures us, 'we are now beginning to see, was a mistake.' His sympathies lie with Wrede's view that Mark wrote under the influence of his theory of the Messianic Secret. If this view were really debated we could raise no legitimate objection to Professor Lightfoot's allegiance, but it is remarkable that, while there are two disparaging references to Sanday's treatment of this theory, no account is given of the objections brought against Wrede's reconstruction by Sanday, Rawlinson, and J. Weiss. In the same royal manner the author dismisses, without the slightest attempt at examination, the view that Luke had at his disposal a special account of the Passion story, on the ground that the theory 'is misleading and unnecessary, if once we have understood his method and his purpose.' The conclusion to which the lectures lead is that the form of the earthly no less than the heavenly Christ is for the most part hidden from us. 'For all the inestimable value of the Gospels, they yield us little more than a whisper of his voice; we trace in them but the outskirts of his ways. Only when we see him hereafter in his fullness shall we know him also as he was on earth.' The spirit of these words seems to us unnecessarily sad, and they throw not a little light on Professor Lightfoot's choice of the aphorism of Isaac Penington which, he says, could well serve as a motto for his lectures: 'All truth is a shadow except the last. But every truth is substance in its own place, though it be but a shadow in another place. And the shadow is a true shadow, as the substance is a true substance.' It is strange that he should express the hope that critics will pause, not once nor twice but many times, before they decide to level the charge against him that he destroys and does not build.

IS RELIGION DOOMED?

If you begin with a view of religion which leaves out the very heart of it, it becomes easy to prophesy a rather speedy disappearance of religion. With all respect we submit that this is what Mr. V. F. Calverton has done in *The Passing of the Gods* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). We say 'with all respect,' and we mean it. For it is an able book, it is a scholarly book, it is a charmingly written book. On the history of religion Mr. Calverton has a right to speak, for he has mastered the subject as few have. But in rejecting to the degree he does the psychology of religion Mr. Calverton leaves himself really incompetent to weigh the probabilities of religion surviving. His idea, of course, is the simple one—show people what function religion served in certain stages of social development and, whatever their feelings about it, they will come to see that what service religion rendered can be better rendered by something else. The functions of religion, he holds, were first to make man feel more at home in Nature and give him supposedly some measure of power over Nature; second, and this was of supreme importance, to be a means whereby man's individualism might be controlled in the interests of society. We do not quarrel with that; so far as it goes it is true. In Mr. Calverton's view the first function is now far better discharged by science; and the second will be increasingly fulfilled as a more perfect social order—he seems to fancy Communism—comes into being. But Mr. Calverton ignores almost entirely that element in religion which in all the higher religions comes to be supreme—the conviction that man as an individual finds himself over against an Other, not Nature and not society, with whom he feels it a matter of extreme importance that he should maintain, or discover, or regain fellowship.

Of any book by Mr. Clement C. J. Webb little commendation is needed except to say that Mr. Webb has written it. *The Historical Element in Religion* (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net) is marked by that fulness of knowledge, sobriety of judgment, and lucidity of diction which are the characteristics of all his work. The main part consists of lectures delivered last year before the University of Bristol on the Lewis Fry Foundation. They deal respectively with the nature of the historical element in religion, its place, its depreciation, its significance. The third of these is, so to say, the problem dealt

with. Very notably since the days of Spinoza there has often appeared a view according to which religion has little if anything to owe to history, its ideas or its values being independent of facts. This is a dangerous fallacy; and the main value of Mr. Webb's little book lies in the exposure of the fallacy. The fifth chapter was suggested by the requests Mr. Webb received to show how his principles might apply to particular problems such as the Virgin Birth and the resurrection of Jesus. Mr. Webb warns us that the views he there sets forth are just his own; and that if any of us cannot accept them, his general position as to the relation of history to religion is not thereby upset.

In *Neoplatonism of the Italian Renaissance* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), Miss Nesca A. Robb, M.A., D.Phil., gives us a very readable and informative study of the philosophical background of the Italian poets, artists, and writers of the Golden Age. Much original research has been involved, but nowhere does the work smell of the lamp. It is clear as well as competent, and the illustrations from the literature of the period are happily chosen.

We have received a very lively and entertaining book entitled *A Short Introduction to the History of Human Stupidity*, by Mr. Walter P. Pitkin (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). The author's thesis is that stupidity is the supreme social evil, inasmuch as three people out of four are fools, and of the actions of the fourth, nine out of ten are foolish. Hence the hopeless muddle into which the affairs of humanity have fallen. The lash is laid on all round with great gusto, and the opinions expressed are often so extreme that one wonders at times whether the whole book is not an elaborate leg-pull. Yet the writer seems serious enough, and much of what he says is within the bounds of reason. He is, as it should be explained, an American, and his view of the present trend of the world is that God's own country is 'sinking into the stale and unprofitable ways of the Old World, which, as we sink, moves like a blind and stricken beast still further downward into the bogs of Asia.' As a sample of detailed criticism, take the following on the drink evil. 'All Africa is drunk after every sunset. Two-thirds of South America is never fully sober. . . . Russia is one long twilight of vodka. . . . Italy and France hiccup gently as they seesaw up and down between midday wine and evening brandy. . . . Germany, Holland, and England reel along, not quite drunk, but with a bleary-eyed view of everything. The West Indies

are an endless sleep in a gutter running with rum. China and India drowse on in a bastard Nirvana of opium, morphine, and rum.' Other vices and stupidities are in proportion. No wonder the writer anticipates that there should be at least 'thirty or forty volumes of the history which ought to follow this prelude.' Of the said prelude or 'brief introduction' (of nearly six hundred pages) we are told that 'about 125,000 words of the original MS. have been omitted simply for the sake of Gentle Reader.' The writing of all these thousands of words only to be scrapped is surely a piece of stupidity for which 'Gentle Reader' will be duly grateful!

In *A Manual of Excavation in the Near East* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. net), by Professor William F. Badé, Director of the Palestine Institute of Archaeology, Berkeley, California, we have a clear and concise description of the methods of digging and recording carried out by the Expedition to *Tell en-Nasbeh* (Benjaminite Mizpah) in Palestine. There is a dearth of such books, due to the fact that systematic scientific methods of excavating did not begin to be applied till about 1908, and the additional fact that since then they have been undergoing a steady development. There is consequently a natural hesitation to publish detailed descriptions of methods, which may have to be overhauled later on. Professor Badé's book is all the more welcome on this account, especially as he and his staff are known to have laid much emphasis in their work upon technique and records. Here the interested reader will find the organized plans which a modern expedition, consisting in this case of a trained staff of not less than ten and about one hundred or more workmen, has employed in order to recover from the earth the still fragmentary story of the past ages. The methods described, although set forth in a Palestinian context, are, with a few unimportant modifications, applicable to archaeological enterprises in any part of the world. The volume is beautifully illustrated, and, being written by an expert, will serve as a useful guide to all intending excavators, and should find a place in every archaeological library.

Karl Barth and his friend Eduard Thurneysen have published another volume of sermons under the title of *God's Search for Man* (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net). The volume contains eighteen sermons which have been selected by Dr. Thurneysen from the various German publications in which they have appeared. As in their previous volume no

indication is here given as to which of the two friends is the author of any particular sermon. This, however, is of little consequence, as there is complete unanimity in their doctrine and modes of thought. The sermons, we may say at once, are of very high quality indeed. Here is real preaching, warm from the heart, direct and insistent in its appeal. It has, of course, the Barthian ring about it. There is outspoken loyalty to the Reformed Faith; God is exalted as the Sovereign Lord who comes in grace for man's salvation; Jesus Christ is made central and all-sufficient, while man's utter dependence on Him is pressed home. These lofty themes give elevation to the discourses. They keep eternity steadily in view, yet they are timely and extremely modern in their tone and application. One can see in them traces of the crisis through which the Church in Germany is passing, a crisis which must be driving earnest men to examine again the foundations of the faith, and which by the blessing of God may lead to even greater preaching yet. Meantime we are grateful for this volume, which shows what treasures can be brought out of the Word, and how its message can be brought home to the heart and conscience of the men and women of to-day.

Mr. Arthur Mee has done such valuable service to the welfare of youth by his various publications that one hesitates to do anything but praise any new book of his. But *God Knows: A Faith for Youth* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net), is not one of his best. It is a little vague, a little eloquent, and not definitely enough Christian. The 'youth' for whom it was written, however, may think differently, and many of them will welcome this reinforcement of faith. And there is a great deal in the book that is both truly and usefully said. It deals in succession with Life, Mind, The Wonderful Partners, The Incredible Past, The Shadow and The Dawn.

From the Baptist Historical Society come two publications. The first is a brochure written by Mr. W. T. Whitley on *Thomas Helwys of Gray's Inn and Broxtowe Hall, Nottingham* (Kingsgate Press; 6d.). The other is a dainty volume embodying a reproduction of Thomas Helwys' *The Mystery of Iniquity* (Kingsgate Press; 10s. 6d. net). Helwys was one of the earliest English Baptists, and his story is well told. To his well-nigh forgotten *Mystery of Iniquity* interest attaches, as Principal Wheeler Robinson points out in an introduction, for the light it casts on the controversies of the early

seventeenth century, and for its advocacy, for the first time in England, of the right of universal religious liberty.

The Christian Religion, by the Rev. F. Warburton Lewis, M.A. (National Sunday School Union; 3s. 6d. net), is a passionate exposition of the religion of the Incarnation. The Christian religion is God's life in man, God's life as we see it in Christ. There is a recurrent distinction in the book between 'facts' and 'theory' or creed. Among the 'facts' cited is this: 'that Christ died—for our sins.' But that is theory, a great theory, and the redemption is in the truth not the fact. The book is full of 'theory' in the best sense. It is all creed, in the best sense. And that is its merit. We value the book because it contains, and emphasizes, and expounds the greatest creed in the world.

It is the aim and, let us say, the achievement of a handsome volume entitled *Anglicanism*, compiled and edited by Mr. Paul Elmer More and Mr. Frank Leslie Cross (S.P.C.K.; 21s. net), to illustrate by extracts from the religious literature of the seventeenth century the thought and practice of the Church of England. Apart from two introductory essays on 'The Spirit of Anglicanism' by Mr. More and 'Anglicanism in the Seventeenth Century' by Mr. F. R. Arnot, the book consists of citations from leading representatives of the erudition and piety of what was a wonderful century in English religious literature. The quotations are grouped

under topics, e.g. the Church, the Bible, Soteriology, Ethics. The work will be found valuable not only by the student of the history of the Anglican Church, but by the student of literature; for it was English divines who brought English prose to its high-water mark in the seventeenth century.

In the Christian religion the treatment of the sick has a place as well as the treatment of the sinner; witness the practice of Jesus and His commission to those whom He sent out. With the emergence of the practice of medicine as a secularized and highly specialized science and art, the churches, broadly speaking, surrendered the sick to the physician and surgeon. No sensible Christian will doubt the necessity of that. Yet in recent times there has come a questioning if the Christian Church may not by the completeness of her surrender have really renounced a responsibility, and deprived suffering humanity of a mighty therapeutic. It is being recognized that in certain mental and even physical disorders and maladjustments there are cases more properly for the priest than for the physician. There is danger here, as some experiences have shown; risk of an ill-instructed young minister rashly trying his hand at suggestion or Couéism or even hypnotism. To all, especially ministers, who are interested we can cordially and strongly recommend study of *Religion and Psychotherapy: A Plea for Co-operation*, by Mr. A. Graham Ikin, M.A., M.Sc. (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). It is eminently wise and sane on this difficult problem.

The Lachish Letters.

By SIR CHARLES MARSTON, F.S.A., LONDON.

IN January last the Wellcome Archæological Research Society's excavations at *Tell Duweir* (Biblical Lachish), in South-west Palestine, brought to light nineteen broken pieces of pottery, which contained ink writings, and thus proved to be of more value than the many thousands of other fragments of earthenware removed from the ruins. They lay among the fallen remains of a room in the gate tower of the city, immediately below the blackened strata left behind by Nebuchadnezzar's soldiers when they burnt their way through Lachish about 600 B.C. The fact that they were

discovered, in spite of a layer of soot, testifies to the thoroughness with which the excavations are being conducted. Those acquainted with the past progress of Palestine excavation are aware that little written evidence had been found. Some have accounted for this by the fact that the Hebrews wrote on papyrus leaves, and that the climate of the country was unsuitable for prolonged preservation. This is, no doubt, a correct hypothesis; and it is to be preferred to any conjectures that the early Israelites were not of a literary character.

During the excavations of Samaria made in 1932 by the Joint Expedition, under the direction of Mr. Crowfoot, some ostraca with fragmentary inscriptions upon them were brought to light. Reference is made to these writings in the Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statements for July and October 1933. A date of about 875 B.C. has been assigned to them. The ink writings which form the subject of this article, though in a similar script to those found at Samaria, are of a far more complete character. Their decipherment and translation have for some months been in the hands of Professor Torczyner of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. At first it was thought that the fragments were copies of letters, the originals of which, written on papyrus leaves, had been sent from the Governor of Lachish to Jerusalem. But the translations now suggest that they were communications, from officers in command of the watch towers or outposts outside the city, either to the Captain of the Guard at Lachish, or to whoever was in command of the city, probably just before it was captured by Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon. It is thought that the final destruction of Jerusalem, and the carrying away of the Jews by Nebuchadnezzar, took place about 588 B.C., but that Lachish may have fallen at the time Nebuchadnezzar deposed Jehoiakim about 600 B.C. According to Jer 34⁷, Lachish and Azekah were the only two fortified cities left to the kingdom of Judah at this time.

The decipherments of the writings are still incomplete, and some of them are tentative; but the following will give a good general idea of their contents, and enable our readers to appreciate their bearing upon Old Testament study.

Potsherd No. 1 reads:

*Gemeriah son of Hasaliah
Jaazaniah son of Tobshalem
Hagab son of Jaazaniah
Mibtahiah son of Jeremiah
Mataniah son of Neriah.*

Here are a group of names, the majority of which occur in the old Testament associated in the same period of time. Thus Gemeriah occurs in Jer 29³, Jaazaniah in 2 K 25²³, Hagab in Ezr 2⁴⁶, Jeremiah (apart from the prophet) is mentioned in 2 K 23³¹, Mataniah occurs in 2 K 24¹⁷, and Neriah in Jer 36⁴.

Potsherd No. 2 says:

To my lord Jaush. May Yahweh let my lord hear news of peace. Now to-day, now to-day, who is thy slave a dog, that my lord has remembered his slave.

May Yahweh destroy thy (impending) evil, of which thou dost not know.

It is conjectured that 'Jaush' was the name of the Captain of the Guard. The message is somewhat enigmatic; perhaps he alone to whom it was addressed would know its precise purport. But the lines were obviously written in a time of trouble. The two direct appeals to the deity suggest that Yahweh was the sole object of worship, and other letters, as well as the proper names, lead to the same conclusion. The expression 'thy slave a dog' reminds us of Hazael's ejaculation to the prophet Elisha (2 K 8¹³).

Potsherd No. 3 contains sixteen lines on the front, and five lines on the reverse. A large portion has been read, but some faint lines delay a complete restoration. The following is a free translation: 'Thy slave Hoshiah has sent to tell my lord Jaush (may God give him tidings of peace). And now I have sent a letter to the seer, and in it referred to the letter which you sent to me the day before telling me to go with him. Since then he has written to me, saying, "My lord I cannot read a letter. As God lives, no one has ever tried to read me a letter, and I have not read any letter which came to me, nor ever seen anything of it." And it has been told to me that the commander of the army, Achbor the son of Elnatan, has passed here on his way to Egypt, and has sent Hodaviah the son of Ahijah and his men to take them from here, and Nedeiah the grandson of the king has brought a letter from the prophet to Shallum the son of Yadau telling him to beware. I have sent it to you.'

The royal genealogy of David recorded in 1 Ch 3, contains the name of Nedabياهو (Nedabiah) as grandson of Jehoiakim (see vv.¹⁶⁻¹⁸). So the letter was written in the reign of the Jehoiakim. Achbor ben al Natan is the reverse of Elnathan the son of Achbor mentioned in Jer 26²²; and there seems no doubt from the context, and from allusions in other letters not yet published, that several of these potsherds refer to the flight of Uriah the prophet to Egypt (Jer 26²⁰⁻²³). It would almost seem as though, among the Lachish garrison, Uriah had sympathizers.

Potsherd No. 4 yields the following:

May Yahweh let hear my lord now to-day tidings of the good. And now, according to whatever my lord has sent so has thy slave done. I have written on the sheet according to whatever my lord has sent (written). And when my lord has sent about Bet Harafa there is nobody, and Semakhyahu him

has Shemayahu taken and brought him up to the city. And thy slave, my lord, will send (write) thither (asking) where he is.

The letter continues on the reverse side of the potsherd with the following most interesting lines : *because, if he in his survey tour would have inspected, he should have known that for the signal stations of Lachish we are observing according to all the signals which gives my lord, because we do not see (the signals of) Azekah.*

The word used for signal is 'Masath,' which is said to occur in the Old Testament only in Jer 61. Attention has already been drawn to the fact that Lachish and Azekah were the only two fortified cities left at this time. These lines on the reverse side definitely identify the ruins, among which these potsherds were found, as those of Lachish. The expression—'written on the sheet'—obviously refers to writing on papyrus. An allusion to Bet-Harafa appears to occur in 1 Ch 4¹².

Potsherd No. 5 is in very bad condition. It is a letter which starts with the usual greetings and mentions letters received by the writer. The last line may have reference to a person who is a descendant of the king.

Potsherd No. 6 is also addressed to Jaush, and speaks expressly about somebody *whose words are not good (fit) to loosen the hands (weaken the hearts) of the guards . . . the hands of the country and the city.* It is further written that this dangerous seer is coming, or being brought to the king to Jerusalem. Here again there seems reference to the Uriah incident.

On Fragment of Potsherd 16 the name of Uriah the prophet appears to be actually mentioned.

The foregoing results, of the decipherment made of the Lachish letters up to the present time, indicate that they are the most valuable documents which have yet been found in Biblical Archaeology. Whereas former discoveries tell us of external events, usually from the records of those who attacked the Israelites, here are contemporary records confirming the internal struggles of the Kingdom of Judah (military, political, and religious) in the last phase of its existence, and all in confirmation of the Old Testament.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the oldest copy of the Old Testament in the Hebrew language only dates back about one thousand years from the present time. The script is in what is known as the Assyrian Hebrew. These Lachish letters are fifteen hundred years earlier, and are

written in a cursive script known as the Phœnician Hebrew. But in style, in composition, in phraseology, and in spelling, they read almost like passages from the Book of Kings or from Jeremiah. These letters, written with a reed pen from some outpost, entitle us to assume that the art of writing was widespread in 600 B.C., and that the Hebrew language was then a fully developed instrument of expression. Reference has already been made to the scraps of similar writing found at Samaria, to which a date of 875 B.C. has been assigned. That carries the use of this script back another two and a half centuries.

Those who have visited Palestine will be aware that at Nablus or Shechem there still live about a hundred Samaritans. These are said to be the descendants of the men transplanted there from Babylon and other cities by the King of Assyria, after he had carried the ten tribes into captivity. It is recorded in 2 K 17²⁸ that one of the priests, who had been carried away, was allowed to come back and teach these immigrants the Law of Moses. The writer has several times visited these Samaritans, and been shown a Samaritan Pentateuch which purports to be an exceedingly ancient copy of the Law of Moses. A good deal has been written about this work. Its interest for the purpose of this article is due to the fact that the script of the Lachish letters is said to be somewhat similar, but older.

It will take time for Bible scholars to digest the importance of the Lachish discovery, and to consider its effect on all branches of Old Testament study. Account will have to be taken of the fact that the Lachish letters presuppose the use of a cursive form of Hebrew writing in common use for a number of centuries before 600 B.C. The Samaritan ostraca witness to the script being in the Northern Kingdom in 875 B.C. How many centuries farther back does it go? Perhaps excavations in the deeper deposits at Lachish may throw light on this subject. In any case, already there has been found at Lachish an earthenware ewer, and a bowl, with alphabetical letterings painted round them. These belong to the period 1285-62 B.C., and are recognized as the connecting link between the Sinai alphabetical script—the oldest known—and the Phœnician. Next to Jerusalem, Lachish was the most important city of the Jewish kingdom. Under the able directorship of Mr. Starkey and his brilliant band of youthful workers, more wonderful discoveries surely await us at Lachish.

Christ's Temptations are ours To-day.

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.SC., ABERDEEN.

SOME kink in the human brain creates a queer preference in many minds for the metaphysical rather than the ethical. The mysteries of the Incarnation and the Eucharistic Presence often attract the speculative instinct more than the moral problems connected with repentance and a personal trust in Jesus Christ. So the fruitful study of the temptations of Christ may be hindered either by connecting them with a mysterious consciousness of having uncanny powers to play with which is supposed to have come to Him at Baptism, or by interminable prolegomena regarding the possibility of real temptation to a sinless nature.

Genuine reflection upon the gospel narrative of the Temptation sees it as the story of the careful examination into the conditions of right effort which Jesus undertook when He became aware of God's call. When Jesus thus lays bare His soul it is to disclose that His temptations were such as beset every moral and spiritual leader, every one who is called to influence other lives; and since 'no man liveth to himself' this means roundly that they are in some measure every man's temptations. If it is true in the rather general sense of Hebrews that Jesus 'was tempted in all points like as we are,' it is equally true and it is the key to the right study of His temptation, that Christ's temptations are ours.

The first temptation was the pressure of physical needs. Why must one conscious of a great call, and aware of the need to face it in quiet alone with God, find himself hampered by hunger? Would it not be reasonable to demand that a man dedicated to a great work should have secured to him at least plain fare? 'Command that these stones be made bread!'

It would surely be an error to think that this temptation came to Jesus only or chiefly about His own comfort. The world then as now contained numbers of miserable folk, poor, hungry, comfortless. It would be a great thing just to feed them. *Panem et circenses*—'bread and circuses'—says sarcastic Juvenal, are all the populace wants. But one need not sneer at the desire for food and a little pleasure. It is not too much for any man to ask, and one can imagine how greatly the compassionate heart of Christ longed to give it. And have we not

Christ's own word for it that men take a right line who feed the hungry and clothe the naked? What greater thing is there to hope to do by any power of miracle or prayer or effort than to 'make these stones bread' for any starving human being? What demonstration of the gospel could be so winning, so convincing, as to prove that religion will make every one well fed and happy?

The strength of this temptation is in the amount of truth it contains; and it is never far away. For example, it has been said that if the Soviet aims at providing food and happiness in the world for every one, Christianity must meet the challenge simply by showing a better fed and happier population in Christendom than in Russia. Again, a rash 'grouper' once committed himself to the theory that if every one joined the Oxford Groups the unemployment question would be solved. And in many quarters the religious work of churches and missions is heavily dependent on the readiness of people to hang around for the sake of charitable gifts and free amusements.

It is a mistake to think that the victory over this temptation is ever as simple and decisive as the swift interchange of words between Christ and the Tempter might suggest. It has to be remembered that the answer, 'man shall not live by bread alone,' sums up the results of forty days and forty nights of hard thinking, and lays down a principle that will not automatically decide each concrete case in which the problem is how best to meet the needs of men. Did not Jesus Himself on occasion feed the multitude and still the tempest? Is it ever easy to decide how rightly to maintain the distinction or determine the priority of spiritual and material needs? Take one course, and critics will say religion deals in words and callously under-estimates the economic factor. Take the other, and the criticism will come that religion is cheapened by being made an affair of 'loaves and fishes.'

There is no rule or code. What Christ reached for Himself and sets down for all is a principle that may be used like a compass as each emergency confronts the steersman. One consideration must dominate; the spiritual needs of man are his greatest, deepest needs, and every brotherly effort

must be inspired and guided by the truth that man does not live by bread alone.

To bring home the universality of this temptation it is enough to allude to the problem that faces parents in the upbringing of a family. Their wish to give them every good thing, their readiness for sacrificing themselves to this end is in a measure like the compassionate love of Jesus for mankind. How, then, will they do best what they wish to do? By assuring comfort, by praying and planning and contriving that their children will never find material conditions hard? A parent may thus labour and pray, and forget that the best he can do is not to shelter or remove them from the common round of toil, but to furnish their souls with inward strength to be in all things 'more than conquerors.' For it is as true for the children as for the fathers that 'man shall not live by bread alone.'

The second temptation was sensationalism. The picture set before the reader, of Jesus and the Devil on the Temple roof, comes from one who spoke in parables. A jump from the pinnacle stands for any spectacular 'stunt' to secure publicity. Jesus was considering how to go about His mission. To influence men He must attract interest, win attention. Should He recklessly stake everything on one throw, daring all and challenging God to back Him? Does not Scripture offer promises that suggest such a course? Jesus' answer was that no one may force God's hand, or impatiently challenge the patience of God. 'Thou shalt not put to a test the Lord thy God.' This remains the standing warning against sensational methods and against the idea that men can ever say they have taken their risks and done their part and can therefore challenge God to do His. The only way of duty is the way of right, of love and service, and in it a man of faith must walk as Jesus did with patience to the end.

There is need for people of the highest religious zeal to face the fact that this temptation is very really there all the time. How, for example, shall a lad prepare for Foreign Mission work? Is he to train in every way that experience suggests may equip him to make contact with and bring help to some pagan folk, or is a raw lad or untrained girl with no qualifications but zeal and heroism to be flung into the fight with heathendom in the conviction that God will use any one who has faith and the right spirit? Or again, when earnest people desire to see a revival of religion and plan a campaign and take a huge hall and issue posters and meet for prayer, do they not sometimes seem to say they have done their part, set the stage,

and God if He be faithful must make a revival begin? And do they not sometimes feel it difficult to admit that as great a faith as their own may be found in people who with more quietness and patience labour and pray? There is a real issue between the modern love of slogans and advertisement and the old-fashioned mistrust of such methods and preference to believe in the Divine plan of waiting for results to grow and show in time.

Here, again, it has to be noticed that this temptation can never be banished finally. The deciding principle may be clear, Thou shalt not test thy God, but the right application of it in the perplexities of varying circumstances is part of the difficult art of living. When is it right to dare all in faith? When is God's will indicated that prudence and quiet perseverance are demanded by the situation? Jesus Himself at times was utterly daring. In the end He took the path that led straight to doom. But also He could be the patient teacher bent not on stampeding but on persuading men. When is it a time to be cautious? When is it a time to take every risk? It is the kind of decision that always needs prayer if a man is to be sure that the risk proposed is not a wayward or petulant impulse of his own, but one that is involved in the doing of a plain duty; not a test of God but an answer to God's test of human faith.

The third temptation is to compromise. Give the devil his due. Admit that there is something in the power of evil that may be used for good ends. A little concession seems to guarantee enormous results. But 'thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'

Compromise was the religious fashion in Jesus' time in the Greek world. The martyrs were peculiar people who insisted on the intolerance of faith. To-day in India and Japan a spirit of genial compromise might win thousands to a nominal acceptance of Christianity. At home any congregation or minister may have to face such questions as 'Why not have raffles at bazaars?' 'Why not advertise spicy or vulgar titles that may draw a crowd within hearing of the gospel?' 'Why should not the German church, it may be asked, go a very long way with the Nazi party for the sake of national influence and unity? At every point the suggestion may be made that people who can show themselves accommodating will achieve far more real good. Vain delusion. There must be no tolerance for anything, and no attempt to use any method, once it is recognized as devilish.

But easy-going or cocksure people who are confident of their ability to steer a right course would do well to ponder the fact that Jesus found His great guiding principles only after forty days and nights of prayer and self-examination and

meditation upon the needs of men, and that even though He went thus armed with 'the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God,' He 'continued in temptations,' and Christ's temptations are those of every man.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

'A Smile in the Voice.'

BY THE REVEREND P. N. BUSHILL, B.A.,
ORPINGTON, KENT.

'Be kindly affectioned one to another.'—Ro 12¹⁰.

EACH Christmas Day there is at the close of the evening News Bulletin an Appeal for wireless sets for the Blind. Last Christmas Day the appeal was made by a blind person himself, who read his speech from a Braille MS. He told us what a boon the wireless was to the blind. The only way they had of recognizing people was by their voice, and the wireless had been the means of introducing them to many famous public men, whose photographs are well known to us, and best of all to the King himself! Until three years ago, when for the first time the King broadcast his Christmas message to his people, they did not know the King at all, as they were, of course, unable to see his portrait which we see so often in the daily papers and in pictures. Now they know him, for he had spoken to them in his own voice.

What a wonderful thing the voice is. In no two children, or grown-ups, is it actually the same, and if our ears were trained as the ears of blind people necessarily are, we should be able easily to detect and note the particular voice of all the different people we meet. Jacob could cover up his skin and act the part of Esau in 'bringing venison to his father, but even he could not cover up his voice. 'The voice is Jacob's voice,' said the sad old man, 'but the hands are the hands of Esau.' You and I are known by our voice: let it be one that people will always be glad to hear.

But another thing this blind speaker said on Christmas Day struck me very forcibly. He said, 'We blind people learn to hear a smile in the voice.' We, who have the use of our eyes, see the smile on the face: the blind man hears the smile

in the voice. Well, that is surely something to cultivate—a smile in the voice. There is a great deal in the way we use our voice. There are classes for voice culture—for the proper use of the voice. Don't you think we all need a little voice culture?—especially, as to how to cultivate a smile in the voice! You know, we each have three kinds of voice—a kind, happy voice; a gruff, cross voice; and something in between, which we will call a neutral voice. a sort of 'it-doesn't-matter-very-much' kind of voice. We may say exactly the same words, but how much depends upon which voice we use! For instance, Mother is upstairs, and she calls you to go and help her. Now the words you say are 'All right, Mother, I am coming.' But which voice are you going to use? No. 1, the kind, happy voice—the voice with a smile in it? 'All right, Mother! I am coming!' or the neutral voice, just drawing it out, 'All—right—Mother—I—am—coming,' that is to say, 'when I've finished what I'm doing'? or will be it the cross voice: 'All ri-i-ght, Mother, I am cum-ming'? You may use the same words, but not only a blind person, but your Mother upstairs also will be able to tell whether there is a smile in the voice or not. Or take another case; your sister wants a pencil, and you say, 'Well, you can have one of mine: take it': but which voice of the three will you use?

The Apostle Paul tells us 'Be kindly affectioned one to another': speak to one another with a smile in the voice. I think Jesus must have used this kind of voice often, otherwise children would not have gathered round Him so eagerly. We sing in one of our hymns:

And that I might have seen His kind look when

He said,

'Let the little ones come unto Me.'

I think a blind person would have *heard* that kind look in His voice: don't you?

Trick Steps.

BY THE REVEREND L. J. HOWELLS, B.A.,
LONDON.

'I almost slipped, I nearly lost my footing.'—
Ps 73² (Moffatt).

I wonder how many of you boys and girls have seen the Tower of London. When I was your age, I used to think of it as one tall tower standing in the air like a Martello, but when I paid it a visit, I saw that it was more like a castle with grounds (where the soldiers still do their drills), and many little towers. There is the Beauchamp Tower where Lady Jane Grey was imprisoned; there is the White Tower, and, amongst several others, the Bloody Tower. I know that this last-named sounds horrible, but when you see the Bloody Tower it is not quite so bad as it sounds. The 'Beef-eater' who conducted me said that Sir Walter Raleigh was once imprisoned in the Bloody Tower, and during that time he wrote his History of the World.

Sir Walter lived and wrote in one room, and slept in another immediately above. Connecting these two rooms is a flight of stone steps. It is about these steps that I want to talk to you.

The steps are not built like an ordinary stairs in your house, but they wind round like a spiral. It is difficult to run up a spiral staircase at any time, but the people who made those steps leading from Sir Walter Raleigh's living-room to his bedroom had made it more difficult still. For they built two of the steps higher than the rest—not much higher, only an inch or so, but it was enough. Enough for what? Well, enough to trip up anybody who thought that the steps were all of the same height. Then, when the invader stumbled, the man at the top of the stairs was ready to strike him with a stone or 'run him through' with a sword. And the name given to the steps higher than the others was 'trick steps.'

You boys come across 'trick steps' in cricket. You get five balls out of six pitched well up, and you score off every one of them. So you think you can deal with the last ball of the over in exactly the same way. You watch the bowler approach the wicket. He takes the same run and has his field placed in the same formation. Then the sixth ball comes. You make a mighty hit at it. Something behind you goes 'click,' and you discover to your dismay that a 'short one' has taken your bails. A 'trick' ball just a little different from the rest. There are 'trick steps' in cricket.

Not only in the Tower of London and in games,

but in life, too, there are 'trick steps.' Day after day you climb all sorts of stairs. Watch for the 'trick steps'! Somebody speaks sharply. Look out! There's a 'trick step' ahead. And its name 'bad temper.' If you are not careful over you'll go. Or, there is one pastry left on the plate. And you are two brothers. You cannot walk in the same way as when the plate was full. Very close at hand is the 'trick step'—*greediness*—and unless you are alert you will tumble. Or, your English teacher has asked your class for two mornings to recite *Hamlet*. On each morning he started with the front row and worked his way, row by row, to the back where you were sitting. So you thought that for the third morning you would learn only the last lines of the speech. But your teacher commenced on that morning with the back line, and you found yourself sprawling over the 'trick step'—*shirked work or laziness*.

In life are all sorts of 'trick steps.'

I told you of the man who used to stand on the top of the steps ready to strike at the invader. You will meet many people who will want to prevent you climbing. But I have to tell you of Jesus who stands at the top of every staircase you ascend. In His hand is no sword or stone, but help, encouragement, love. He wants to save you from falling. Plenty of men and women, and boys and girls, can say, 'I almost slipped, I nearly lost my footing, but He saved me.' You cannot do better than trust and love and serve JESUS who stands at the top of the stairs.

The Christian Year.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

What the Saints may learn from the Worldling.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN LENDRUM, D.D., ELGIN.

'And the Lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. . . . Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness.'—Lk 16⁸⁻⁹.

Had Jesus told of a steward who was wholly good, or of one who was entirely bad, the story would have been ordinary and dull, and the people would hardly have listened to it. But when He spoke of a bad man, a thoroughly bad man, whom at the same time He praised for something that was good in him, they would prick up their ears and begin to be interested. Jesus therefore framed a story in which the villain was also the hero. He deliberately made the steward dishonest because by setting

his prudence over against the dark background of his dishonesty. He was able to isolate the prudence. He proposed to praise and make it stand out in bold relief.

Here was a servant who had been cheating and defrauding his master, and now, suddenly, was sent for and told to produce his accounts. He was found out; dismissal was certain. How did he meet the crisis? He did not sit down and do nothing, waiting for the blow to fall upon him. He did not go to bed and begin to be sorry for himself, losing time and sapping his energy. Nor did he make a bolt, rushing off into a world where no one knew him or was likely to help him, where he would have either to work with his hands or beg. He did better than that. He at once got into touch with certain of his master's tenants who were in arrears with their rents and made new agreements with them on much easier terms, thereby bringing them under a large obligation to himself and ensuring that, when he was cast adrift, there would be some on whom he had a claim and on whom he could count to receive him into their houses.

It was a clever plan, and, as clever things are apt to be, dishonest. For he reduced the tenants' rents not because they were unjustly high but simply to create interest for himself. For his own ends he diverted money that should have gone to his master. It was at his master's expense he provided for his own future. It was not merely a selfish thing to do; it was a fraud, a theft.

And then, to the surprise and astonishment of His hearers, Jesus, having told His story, 'commended the unjust steward.' He praised a scoundrel and held him up as an example. For, said Jesus, see how prudent he was, how far-sighted, how wise! What energy, what promptitude! He did not sit down and do nothing, the easiest and the worst thing a man can do. Here was a man who looked ahead and, seeing what was bound to come, prepared for it; as soon as ever he saw what had to be done, he set about doing it. As you listened to His story, you were judging this steward, condemning him for his dishonesty, saying to yourselves what a villain he was, and perhaps thanking God you were so different and so superior. But what a great thing it would be if you good people had something more of what this bad man had—something more of his prudent foresight and wisdom, of his alertness and promptitude, of his energy and readiness to act!

For, He added, 'the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.' In their own worldly sphere, in their own worldly

way, the children of this world are wiser than the children of light. Worldly people show far more prudent and practical concern about their material welfare in this world than good, religious people do about their spiritual well-being in the world beyond. They are far more zealous and energetic in their worldly affairs than Christians often are in what they declare to be far more important—things moral and spiritual. See how active those children of this world are—how hard they work to make money and get on in the world, what pains they take so as to sing well or to speak well, or even to excel in sport. What a rebuke they are to the children of light who in the pursuit of far greater ends—in preaching and teaching the truth, in managing the affairs of the Church, in extending the Kingdom of God, in the perfecting of character—are often so careless and easy-going, so planless and apathetic! If children of this world are so keen on worldly success, Christians should be at least equally keen on moral and spiritual attainment. If they think and plan and toil and slave so as to lay up treasure on earth, we ought to be far more alert and earnest and devoted in the laying up of treasure in heaven. If they deny themselves food and drink, and practise endlessly to keep themselves fit, so as to play well in a match or run well in a race and win some cup or title, ought we not to show something of the same intensity and concentration and willing self-denial in caring for our souls, in making them as good as possible, in striving to lay hold of life eternal and a crown that is incorruptible? There are business men who have made railways, cut canals, opened up new tracts of country, carried their trade and commerce, their inventions, their newspapers to the ends of the earth; might there not be more of the same statesmanship and energy and enterprise among the followers of Christ in the work of extending His Church and Kingdom?

So then, instead of judging worldly people and despising them and holding aloof from them as if they were inferior and had nothing to teach us, we ought to make friends and keep in touch with them, marking their good points, and ready to take a hint or learn a lesson from them. 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness,' said Jesus. Not, of course, to copy their dishonest ways or imbibe their worldly spirit, but to observe and admire and imitate their foresight and promptitude and enthusiasm and activity. Have we not Christ's word for it that they are wiser than we are? See how well they know what they want, how badly they want it, how with all their powers they

seek it—and get it! Be humble enough to take a lesson from them, to be rebuked by the example they show. You believe for your part that the soul is more than the body, character more than money, eternal life more than worldly success. Therefore into this nobler quest of yours put something of the wisdom and zeal and energy which you see the children of the world putting into their affairs. And for you as for them it will prove true that he who seeks finds. Indeed, as in seeking the highest things you are seeking what God means you to seek, you have God and all the powers of the Unseen upon your side, and victory is assured you.

TENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Looking down on Jerusalem.

BY THE REVEREND FREDERICK A. M. SPENCER,
D.D., OXFORD.

'And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes.'—Lk 19^{41, 42}.

One day in June 1918 I found myself in the 'Garden of Gethsemane' belonging to the Roman Church. I was returning, after an interview with the Senior Chaplain of the Australian Imperial Force in Egypt and Palestine, to get my outfit in Cairo, having been recently gazetted Chaplain to the 7th Regiment of the A.I.F., and was spending a night in Jerusalem. I conversed with the Franciscan Brother in charge of the Garden. After pointing out to me the olive-tree of our Blessed Lord's agony and indicating the place, beyond the high wall bounding the Garden, where he believed the three disciples to have remained, he concluded by earnestly recommending me to walk up the path leading to the ridge of the Mount of Olives and look at *Dominus lacrimavit*. I followed his directions and soon found on the right of the path as one goes uphill, a few feet below the top, this inscription: '*Dominus videns civitatem lacrimavit super eam*.'

I turned and looked at Jerusalem, and tears came into my eyes. As I gazed down on modern Jerusalem—a strangely fascinating city, neatly enclosed on the east and south by the walls erected by Suliman Pasha in the sixteenth century, the Dome of the Rock near and very prominent, standing where the Temple stood, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in the distance, and a great assembly of sacred buildings, Christian and Jewish and Muhammadan—as I gazed down on this city of

competing faiths and interpretations of the One Faith, I seemed to be carried back to the day when Christ gazed down on the Jerusalem of Judaism, with its splendid Temple built by Herod the Great, and to feel something of the passionate and exalted but thwarted patriotism which throbbed in His breast and in the breasts of His disciples. For it was the city of the nation chosen by God Almighty to make Him and His salvation known to all the world, but which in its blind perversity was rejecting its high calling and the things which belonged unto its peace and, obsessed by an arrogant and fanatical nationalism, was soon to draw down upon itself the brutal legions of an exasperated Rome and to suffer the horrors of a prolonged siege ending in its utter destruction. What might have been and what was to be! The glorious vocation and the dreadful self-chosen doom!

The vision of the prophet of the many peoples saying, 'Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and the house of the God of Jacob,' so that 'out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem,' was a fair dream swept away by the disordered phantasies of a heady nationalism and crazy imperialism; and therefore women would cook and eat their own babies, the Holy of Holies would be smashed and defiled, and thousands would expire in the agonies of crucifixion outside the walls. No wonder the Messiah sobbed as He beheld the city with its meretricious splendour, and saw into its evil and foolish heart, and foresaw the awful doom it was rushing into headlong and unwitting!

Yet in place of this patriotic devotion to the material Jerusalem there arose in the minds of the disciples the hope of, and devotion to, the new Jerusalem, 'the city of God coming down from heaven,' the Church offering membership to men of all nationalities, the Body of Christ, 'a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, . . . but holy and without blemish.' Israel according to the flesh had spurned its honourable mission of giving a lead to the other nations in the quest for peace and salvation. And the hope that had been reposed in it must be transferred to its successor, the heavenly Israel, compact of individuals of many peoples, which would indeed be the mouthpiece of God to the distracted and tormented race of men.

The ancient pathos and tragedy held me spell-bound, as I stood by the simple inscription, a Latin translation of the Gospel words, and let my eyes wander over the fantastic medley of domes and towers and minarets spread out before me. I felt

also the exhilaration of man's new hope spring from the ashes of the old.

But our Lord's entry into Jerusalem is to be viewed in the light of the more explicit reference to the Old Testament indicated by St. Matthew. The First Evangelist, we may well believe, was correct in attributing to Jesus the intention of fulfilling the prediction of Zechariah: 'Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass.' The ass was the steed of peaceful processions, in contrast to the horse, which was associated with battles. Jesus made His entrance into Jerusalem on a donkey to symbolize His Messianic office of Prince of Peace. He rode in, the Herald of world peace, making the appointed signal to Israel to fulfil its mission as the pioneer of peace among the nations of the world, even though He knew the signal would not be regarded. Did He not believe that though it was disregarded then, yet in an age to come men would read of it and reflect and take heed and respond? His triumphal riding into Jerusalem on an ass constituted an abiding gesture to humanity of God's call to international peace and brotherhood.

To understand its full significance, we should consider the continuation of the words of Zechariah, which Matthew does not quote: 'And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off: and he shall speak peace unto the heathen: and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth.' To express this prosaically, the Christ will order the disarmament of Israel, as a sign and example to the other nations of the world, thus establishing a universal federation of mankind under His peaceful sway. The chariot, the war-horse, the battle-bow—these were three typical implements of war, as we might say—more horribly—'bombing aeroplanes, poison-gas, and submarines.' Israel was at the behest of the Messiah to destroy its own munitions in order to impress the rest of the world with its sincerity in 'renouncing war as an instrument of national policy,' and as a token of trust in other nations doing the same.

When Jesus wept over Jerusalem and then rode amid the acclamations of His compatriots into Jerusalem, did He not think of this prophecy of Zechariah in its wider implications? Did He lament only because of the dreadful destruction of Judaism and its city, with the forfeiture of its glorious privileges, or did He not also foresee a long succession of wars—wars begotten of pride

and jealousy and greed and hatred and fear, waged with cruelty and resulting in awful misery and pitiful destruction, wars even among the peoples which professed a nominal allegiance to His Name—all because Israel knew not the things which belonged either to its own or to the world's peace, nor the time of its visitation, namely, the call of God to its predestined mission of inaugurating international brotherhood. Surely His tears over the death-throes of Israel were tears over the death-throes of all the nations in the wars that would have been averted if only Israel had been aware of the appearance and voice of God.

Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world, died and lives to take away the great sin of war. Even now we may think of Him as looking down on Christendom as once He looked down on Jerusalem, sorrowing and reproachful that even those nations which succeeded Israel as channels of revelation have not yet known the things which belong unto their peace. Should not His Church have long ago called on the nations which adhered to it, not only to abjure war among themselves, but have invited all the other nations of the globe to join in a compact of friendship and mutual aid? On the contrary, Hindu and Buddhist and Confucian have shown themselves more peaceable than the nominally Christian nations of Europe.

And yet to-day there is at least a hankering after peace, as is manifest in the Covenant of the League, the Kellogg Pact, and the prolonged discussions to achieve disarmament. But why are they so prolonged and ineffective? It is because the nations are still endeavouring to make peace by merely human methods, with shifts and expedients that fail to remove the mutual mistrust and fear of war that induce war. Do the statesmen of the avowedly Christian nations seriously attempt to take God into their counsels, or rather to enter into the counsels of God, believing that He has a plan which it behoves them to discover and carry into effect? Do they seek to know the Prince of Peace, in order to establish peace? Yet what is to bring about that repentance, that change of heart, that seeking and finding of God which is essential? Surely, if one of the great nations of Christendom did really offer itself to God in Christ's Name, in whole-hearted trust and self-consecration, then God would use that nation as of old He offered to use Israel. He would make that nation a Messianic nation, an agent of His love to the whole of humanity, for the realization of the ideal of universal brotherhood, which is a

stage in the coming of the perfect Kingdom of God.

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Pool and a Conduit.

'He made a pool, and a conduit, and brought water into the city.'—2 K 20²⁰.

From among the achievements of one of the most illustrious of the kings of Judah, who had to his credit many notable services for his people, this thing is singled out by the chronicler for special mention. Under his rule a great religious revival had been brought about, after long and disastrous years of defection. Notable advance had also been made in national prosperity. Considerable success had attended their arms in the field. Yet Hezekiah is chiefly to be remembered for an engineering feat. He dug a reservoir in the hard basaltic rock of the hill country round Jerusalem, in order to conserve the water of the springs there; and then he constructed a conduit, a stone water-pipe, by which to convey the water to the city. So that a supply of pure water, with all that it would mean to the closely crowded inhabitants of the walled capital, was available. It was a fine thought, finely carried out. For many generations Hezekiah's pool and conduit were a priceless boon to the city. Even now bits of the ruins remain.

We may see in this feat of an ancient king a symbol of the Christian life. Symbolism and parable are the most effective methods for the presentation of religious truth. Rightly used, they may take us to the heart of things as definition and un-descriptive dogma never can. Here is a case in point. The pool and the conduit may represent the distinctive character of the Christian life. They suggest the reality of our resources, and the responsibility that rests upon us of communicating something of them to the world in which we live. Personality is a spiritual pool, fed from the springs of God, high up in the everlasting hills, and its outflowing service on behalf of others like a conduit, carrying the life-giving water to the area of human need.

It might seem unnecessary to insist that the conduit without the pool is useless. Yet even so obvious a fact seems to be overlooked by many, especially by the modern serious-minded young people who are attracted by the call to social service. In all conscience there is a need for such service. Conditions in the world are bad enough.

And every effort to better them—to remove the injustices, and to stop the exploitation, and to remedy the evils due to bad housing and the thousand other blots of our civilization—is to be welcomed and commended. But the Spirit of Christ is the only life-changing power in the universe; and to expect any permanent change in the quality of life apart from Him is as futile as to expect water from a conduit which is not connected to a pool. We cannot communicate what we lack ourselves. We cannot change human nature by organization and clubs and legislation. We must establish a contact with the source of life for the maintenance of our own inspiration, as well as for the helping of others.

On the other hand, we cannot take Christianity to our spiritual comfort, ignoring the needs of our brethren. Christianity has always represented a searching challenge to selfishness. You may be a Christian and poor. You may be a Christian and undistinguished. You may be a Christian and rich—although Jesus says that the latter is difficult and of infrequent occurrence. But you cannot be a Christian and selfish. The two things are completely opposed.

Miss Cornelia Meigs, the latest biographer of Louisa Alcott, writes that no matter how busy she was, 'she managed to find time to teach in a little Sunday school, what we would now call a settlement. The Alcott family were all of them generous and habitually gave away everything that could, or could not, be spared. One of their friends, coming to stay for a visit, observed that their extremely plain and meagre meals were reduced from three a day to two, since they were carrying the third daily to a family in great need. It was one of their beliefs that no matter how poor a person is he or she always has something which can be given away.'

The Christian verities may be the subject of thought, but, if they are not applied, they are mere abstractions, lovely pictures and castles in the air. They are not *truths* to us until they are lived out. A 'good man' is no good until he's good for something! We cannot divide Christ, taking that part of His gospel which relates to our eternal enrichment and leaving that which relates to duty and service, the generous outflow of a redeemed life in practical goodness. There is no Christianity which is a 'get' without a 'give'! That is paganism. Anything less than a conduit-life, open at both ends, filled in order to flow, quickened in order to be a quickening influence, enriched to be an almoner of the Son of God, is

not Christian according to the New Testament. The gospel is, Christ *for* me, Christ *in* me, Christ *through* me.

Every Christian minister makes saddening acquaintance with people who will applaud his ministry because it presents the things they believe about God's love and their own salvation, but who are not spiritually sensitive enough to recognize the crushing discrepancy between the things they assent to, and the lives they are content to live. Such people would be worried to death if they were indebted to their tradesmen. But they never think of their debt to humanity—that is, their debt to God, payable by regular instalments to humanity. They are the people who 'really have no time' for any organized Christian service. What with business, and amusements, and harmless (but for the most part futile) social life, they are 'full up to the eyes.' They are! And their eyes are blinded! They tell you that 'really, in these days of high taxation, the idea of giving a tenth of one's income to the work of God is simply ridiculous.' They declare that it is utterly unreasonable to hope to win the majority of people to Christian idealism, as though that disposed of the question of service. The answer is, of course, that Christianity, as Christ taught it, has always been a forlorn hope and a lost cause. That is why it takes a man to be a Christian; a man, not only convinced of the love of Christ to his own comfort, but constrained by that love to give himself in costly and self-sacrificing service for the eternal good of others.

If we are Christian and profess to have discovered the springs of living water that proceed from Christ, have we ever taken one drop of that living water to another? Is there any one in the wide world who thinks of us with gratitude as the one responsible for the conveyance to him of the gift of God? Are we offering our life, vitalized and enriched by the life of Christ, to the blessing of the world and the extension of His rule? It is true that there is a widespread and depressing consciousness that no individual counts much in the over-organized, over-mechanized life of our crowded modern cities. We are all apt to think that the value of the individual is one of the things that we have lost with the quiet spaciousness of days long gone. But Christianity puts its emphasis *there*—upon the individual. Let us remember that whatever goodness there is in the world has come to it through individuals.

We cannot serve the world unless we consecrate ourselves to Christ, to live His way, under His direction and in His power. It means making

every activity and relationship of life a channel through which He can reach those with whom we come into contact. 'Freely ye have received, freely give.' Every man must, in his own way and in the circumstances in which he is placed, bring the spiritual values into life—sweetening toil, cleansing all relationships from bitterness, making temporal reproduction of eternal realities. Loving as He has loved. Forgiving as He has forgiven. Walking as He walked.¹

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

How often shall I forgive?

'Then came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven.'—Mt 18^{21f}.

There are many points in life where the way of Jesus clashes with our natural inclinations and prejudices. If it does not sometimes face us with some unwelcome challenge, it is time to examine our Christianity and find out whether it is real, or only a coloured or colourless imitation. And one of the points where the challenge of Jesus comes right up against our natural inclinations is this demand for forgiveness.

1. The first thing we have to make sure of when an injury is done is that our own hearts are free from the pride that takes offence. 'No man,' says Emerson, 'ever had a point of pride that was not injurious to him.'

The second thing Jesus bids us do is to make what a well-known writer calls 'an adventure in friendship'—to stretch out our hands to unlikely people, to unlikeable people, to unfriendly people, to people who are difficult, that through our friendship we may win them to a better mind and link them on to the Christian fellowship. And among those adventures the most profitable may be with people who have deliberately broken friendship. That method was His own. When we look at His victories with people we see they were all won by these adventures in friendship. Take the case of Zaccheus, a man whom every one cold-shouldered. When Jesus went to Jericho, where there were many homes that would have been open to Him—for He was still a popular figure—it was in the home of Zaccheus He chose to find a lodging, and received an amazing welcome. Then He won Zaccheus for the Kingdom of God.

¹ John Stuart Holden: *A Book of Remembrance*, 133.

In his play *Escape*, where Mr. Galsworthy pictures a convict seeking shelter in various strange places, and among them in the home of two maiden sisters, it is the religious sister who wants to give him up to the police. One cannot think that that picture would be true in all cases. But it points to a danger—that a typical Christian of to-day would be so shocked by what the man had done that he would never see the man behind, with his aching heart and his tangle of miseries. The last position for a Christian man to take up to one who has done wrong is the attitude of cold aloofness or stern censoriousness. That only widens the breach and hardens the heart. It may even shut against the sinner the gates of the Divine forgiveness, by making it impossible for him to realize it in a living human contact; for, in the hour of their souls' need, we mediate God to others whether we are aware of it or no.

2. This has been the drift of Christ's talk with His disciples. But just then Peter, who was nothing if not practical, put his question, 'Lord, how often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him?'

There is to be no end to your forgiveness, says Jesus. You are always to keep the door open from your side, even though it may be shut from the other.

This counsel is not very palatable. The reason is partly because we do not understand it. The common idea is that forgiveness is the annulment of a debt or the cancelling of an account. Some one has done us an injury. We might justly pay him out; but we refrain—*that*, we imagine, is forgiveness. We might take him to court; but we agree not to prosecute—*that*, we think, is forgiveness. We find he has done us a bad turn in business; we might retaliate in kind, but we forbear—*that*, we think, is forgiveness. But that was not Christ's idea of forgiveness. We ought not, in truth, to speak of forgiving the sin at all. The sin is done and cannot be undone.

The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on: nor all your Piety nor Wit

Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.

It is the man who is forgiven. Forgiveness is the effort to win the man who has offended us into fellowship. And forgiving the man means restoring him to friendship, turning the enemy into a friend, taking steps which shall bring him to change his mind, so that he will become our ally and not our foe—thus healing the break.

We speak about forgiving people when they have repented. Jesus' way is to forgive people *in order that they may repent*. In fact, the word 'forgiveness' is too poor a word. Jesus means so much more by it that He makes it almost a meaningless word. In this case Christ stretched the word to fit the loving spirit which He demands, till it broke in His hand. Until seventy times seven He did not wait till men repented before He offered forgiveness. For in the very hour when they were putting Him to death on the Cross, amid their jeers and curses and the wounds of agony by which they were breaking His body, He prayed, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' Nothing they had done to Him, or were doing, stemmed for one moment the stream of healing and redeeming love—that love whose glory burned undimmed through all the centuries—still the greatest thing in all the world, so that we need only open our hearts to its blaze to have it flood our nature and burn us clean of evil. And this forgiveness, He tells us, is God's way. Doth not He send His sun to shine on the evil as on the good? It is not because He is indifferent to evil. It is because nothing can stop His loving. Man tortures the earth with strife, and God sets to work even on the scars, to cover them with flowers and bring life and beauty into the place of ruin and death.

Dr. Grenfell, in his reminiscences, tells this story from his early medical days. A woman was brought into hospital dying of burns, caused through the drunken cruelty of her husband, who had thrown a lighted lamp at her. It was the climax of a long series of blows and insults. The police brought him to the hospital to see her, and tried to extract some word from her dying lips which would convict him of the crime. She looked at him steadily for a moment, and then, with what was almost her last breath, she whispered, 'My God! It was an accident.' Sir Frederick Treves telling the same story says: 'Her words expressed her faithfulness to the man who had called her wife, her forgiveness for his deeds of fiendish cruelty, and a mercy so magnificent as to be almost Divine.'

3. But we must get a clear view of what this friendship means. Love is not sentimental weakness that is ready to pass over wrong, because it involves too much trouble to do anything else, or because it hates a disturbance. Love is valuing people for their spiritual worth. Love is, therefore, constructive of personality. And if love is to be constructive of personality, it must be ready to do what is truly best for the spirit. It may be

best for the person who has wronged us to be brought even by stern ways to realize his sin.

There is a real place in society for redemptive suffering. But it will always have the criminal in view, not the sleek satisfaction of the community in the thought that he has got what he deserves.

The same thing is true of our complications with other nations. The day is past when we can be content with agreements that keep us at different sides of a fence, absorbed in our own rights. When trouble is afoot we can no longer think first, or only, of our own rights, even when these have been infringed. The way of peace in a world like this can be found by no other way than by the way of constructive friendship that will suffer and be patient even against its own interests.

But for individuals or classes or nations to reach that attitude it means suffering. The way of constructive friendship for Jesus was, in the end, the way of the Cross. Yet the way of love conquers,

as we see in the case of Judas, and Paul, and the centurion at the Cross, and the dying thief. These were but the first-fruits. And this world is only the sowing time. The harvest of love laid down lies mostly beyond. The way of love takes time. We have to wait. But the way of constructive friendship is the way that is secure. It is God's way with us.

'I believe in the forgiveness of sins.' How gladly we say it! But if this creed is to be real, it must mean for us more than God's forgiveness of ourselves, as His method. It must mean—I believe in the *forgiving* of sins. I believe in friendship; I believe in the way of redeeming love. I believe in the love that beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, as the policy of men and nations. That was what Jesus meant when He taught us to pray: 'Forgive us our sins, as we forgive them that sin against us.'¹

¹ J. Reid, *In Touch with Christ*, 230.

Cardinal Newman: Almost a Critic.

By G. H. COCKBURN, B.A., ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, VANCOUVER.

THERE are so many 'ifs' in the lives of great men that one would hesitate to add another to the many suppositions of what J. H. Newman *might* have been or done, if it were not for the fact that his biographers seem to have neglected a valuable document which is of especial interest to students in the field of Biblical Criticism.

I refer to the letter of Oct. 30, 1864, from Dean Stanley to J. C. Shairp which is contained in *The Life and Letters of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D.*, by Prothero and Bradley (John Murray, London, 1893), vol. ii. pp. 340 f. Stanley had been invited to preach in Birmingham; he took advantage of the occasion to call at the Oratory, where he had an interview with Newman, in which the main topic was current Biblical Criticism. Since leaving the Church of England in 1845, Newman had met few Anglicans: even his old familiar friend Pusey had not seen him for eighteen years. He was therefore glad to see the Dean, and in the ensuing conversation took a keen part, in which he revealed very interesting opinions. As the talk took place within a day or two of the letter, one may probably be confident that Stanley's report to Shairp preserves Newman's words practically intact. The interview

has a secondary interest in occurring just five months after the publication of the *Apologia*: it is sufficient to say, however, that here for once Newman neglected his doctrine of 'reserve'!

Newman was willing to recognize the composite character of Genesis: he said, 'It struck me the moment I first read these chapters in Hebrew. There must be two documents. And I mentioned it to Pusey, who seemed to acknowledge it.' He was fearful, however, of the effects of Old Testament Criticism on the New Testament. Several times he urged on Stanley what a great service Ewald or any of the contemporary Old Testament critics would do if they would only 'draw a distinction between the dissolving criticism of the Old Testament and the Gospels.'

It is especially interesting to-day to see why he was so keen for this—it was no less than that he himself had come to see his New Testament as many moderns see it. But let him speak for himself. After admitting that Genesis was composite, he continued: 'I seem to myself to see this same compilatory character in the Gospels: not a regular history, but biographical anecdotes strung together.' Stanley writes that as Newman said this 'the fear seemed

to revive.' Newman, despite his famous 'leap in the dark,' had perhaps not found the certain surety where no thoughts nor hypotheses can disturb a man: his tragedy was, indeed, that he should have sought it. To be afraid to pursue such clues, lest they disturb the Faith, is not to have faith but agnosticism. Stanley's reply was characteristic of the larger trust of the Liberal school: he pointed out that no artificial line could be drawn, the books must each stand on their merits. He urged on Newman that, as Newman himself has indicated, the Roman Church was not entirely dependent on a Scriptural base, and was therefore able to pursue Biblical Criticism much better than Protestantism. The Roman Catholic agreed: he said that such speculations were 'not in the least' ruled out by the Council of Trent; nevertheless for the present it was difficult—the French Revolution had impoverished the Church, and there were nowadays no great theologians.

It may be that such thoughts, perhaps further inspired by this interview, were influences in Newman's after life. Certainly, when in Rome as Cardinal in 1879, he remarked to Father Neville that if ever he became Pope he would appoint two Commissions, the one on Biblical Criticism, the other on the History of the Early Church. These would make a full and candid investigation and report. Characteristic of Newman, perhaps, is the rider that his *successor* would be able to act upon these.¹

Stanley's final impression of the interview was that Newman's was a 'totally wasted life.' Such a brain, with such thoughts, might have been a burning and shining light in nineteenth-century scholarship, might have founded an English School of criticism within the first half of the nineteenth century which would have led Germany and the world. In his early days he needed the right influences; but Pusey was reactionary, Keble a poet and saint rather than a scholar, Froude but a Romantic and undisciplined thinker. It was an encircling gloom, in which he for a while, like the knights who sought the Grail in Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, 'followed wandering fires.' Had he and not Pusey gone to Germany then the needed stimulus, plus the disciplining of emotion, might have in him changed the course of Anglican scholarship.

Such reflections are borne out by examination of his writings. Probably no man kept his fears and doubts out of his work more than Newman: even the *Apologia* is not a complete self-exposure. But

one may find some evidence of critical perceptions in such phrases as 'there being confessedly little of system or completeness in any portion of the New Testament.'² Again, his remarks in the same work on the Sayings of our Lord have special interest: 'observe how the Evangelists heap His words together, though unconnected with each other. . . .'³ Here he instances Lk 9⁴⁶⁻⁶², and in italicizing the sayings in this extract, he does not italicize such connective words or phrases as moderns would suppose to be editorial additions. After also instancing in this connexion Mt 22 and Mt 18, he notes of the sayings in each that 'these separate verses, though succeeding one the other with somewhat more of connexion are yet complete each in itself, and very momentous.' His conclusion is that 'No one can doubt, indeed, that as the narratives of His miracles are brought together in one as divine signs, so His sayings are accumulated as lessons.'⁴

Why, then, did he go no further? His upbringing had trained him to a too superstitious attitude, perhaps; Oxford had confirmed it, and Pusey's own reaction to German critical schools was no factor of encouragement. But there was more: he did not follow the kindly light of his God-given reason because he distrusted it: he said in 1843: 'Reason can but ascertain the profound difficulties of our condition, it cannot remove them; it has no work, it makes no beginning, it does but continually fall back, till it is content to be a little child, and to follow where Faith guides it.'⁵ Such a sentence expresses a peculiar distrust of the ultimate rightness of things: a modern scholar, whose faith of wordless trust gives him peace and assurance, would use reason with the greater confidence. But it accords well with the attitude that could support such statements as this: 'The Christian, if he examines the basis of authority of scripture, will do it not (as is sometimes irreverently said) "impartially" and "candidly" which means sceptically and arrogantly . . . but with a generous confidence in what he has been taught.'⁶ It is only a profoundly pessimistic man who would consider that bias was necessary to discover ultimate truth. And so he worked out his scheme of preferences—Scripture to be obeyed before Moral Sense or Reason, Catholic Antiquity

² *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church* (1837), p. 40.

³ *Ib.* 350.

⁴ *Ib.* 352.

⁵ *Sermons chiefly on the Theory of Religious Belief* (1845), p. 354.

⁶ *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church* (1837), 162-163 (condensed).

¹ *Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, by Wilfrid Ward (Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., London, 1927), ii. 477.

before Scripture as interpreted by Reason, etc.¹ Finally, he accepted the Roman dogmatic system. Surely this was the end of these pessimistic doubts and shining thoughts that so temptingly dazzled!

No—this letter of Dean Stanley shows that his road still lay 'o'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent,' for it is the penalty of having such a brain as Newman's that, although one may not act upon or write down the thoughts and hypotheses that throng up from one's observation, reading, or

¹ *Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church*, (1837), 160-161.

experience, such thoughts come. Only God knows Newman's cross. Somehow one bows to him, for if he failed to be what one might have wished him, he nevertheless was a great prose writer, a remarkable psychologist (Aldous Huxley notes this),² a devoted priest, and an influence for good on the lives of thousands of young men, then and now. It is not for nothing that Stanley, in his letter to Shairst, refers to Newman as *Filius hominis*.

² Note the praise of Newman in this respect from such a writer as Aldous Huxley in his *Proper Studies* (Chatto & Windus, London, 1929), p. xix.

Poetry Recitation and Biblical Emendations.

POEMS OF THE BIBLE RETRANSLATED.

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL I. W. SLOTKI, M.A., LITT.D., MANCHESTER.

I. THOUSANDS of conjectural emendations have been introduced in the text of the Bible by scholars in many lands since the scientific study of Scripture began. These emendations fill volumes of learned journals and are perpetuated in the critical commentaries with which all modern students of Holy Writ are expected to be acquainted. Men to whom every word of Scripture is sacred may bemoan the liberty taken with the sacred writings; but the stream of textual criticism passes them by, feeding in its course the budding scholar, the future teachers of our Universities, the potential leaders of thought.

Furious, however, is the struggle for and against textual emendations among Bible scholars themselves. Not only does the battle rage between those who are in favour of emendations and those who are resolutely opposed to all alterations of text, but also between those who, viewing emendations approvingly, would prefer such new readings as are totally at variance with those advanced with equal confidence by others.

Whilst it must be admitted that not all emendations can stand the test of unbiased criticism, and that a goodly number of those that had been advanced have been justifiably rejected, it cannot be denied that so many emendations still hold their ground, enjoying almost universal approval among literary critics, that modern scholarship seems to have come to regard them as the sole solutions of apparently corrupt, or unintelligible texts.

A new source for emendations was brought into existence when the discovery was made that the poems of the Old Testament conformed to certain laws of rhythm or metre. Bickell, Sievers, Duhm, and Gunkel among others in Germany; Briggs, Powis Smith, Gowan, Ball, and others in England and the United States, to mention a few out of many, have introduced a considerable number of emendations *metri causa*, only in order to harmonize, in a poetical composition, what seemed to be an irregular beat or beats with the predominant metre of the rest of the poem.

While it is not intended at the present juncture to defend the critics or their antagonists, or to enter into a discussion on the validity of some of the laws of metre so confidently laid down, an attempt will be made to show that the necessity for many of the emendations and alterations of the text has not very seldom arisen through our ignorance of the mode of the *writing arrangement* followed by the ancient scribes, and through our lack of knowledge of the way ancient poems were once recited.

II. Our ignorance might be said to extend to all the laws of form in ancient Hebrew poetry. Practically none of these laws has come down to us from the time when the composition of such poetry was still a living art. The laws of the forms of ancient Hebrew poetry that are known to scholarship to-day have been formulated only in recent centuries and are not based even on any definite tradition. Beyond a possible reference to parallelism there is no

mention whatever of the laws of the forms of Hebrew poetry in any part of the vast literature of the Talmud or Midrash. All that has been said on the laws of Biblical metre in the Jewish literature of the Middle Ages has, as a famous scholar has pointed out, merely the value of antiquarian speculation and nothing more, since long before those days all the laws of metre had been completely forgotten. The Hebrew poetry of the Middle Ages, which is generally composed on the pattern of Arabic verse, has absolutely no metrical connexion with the poems of the Old Testament. While the poems of the former conform to laws of metre and rhythm which are well known and defined, the laws of the latter cannot in any way be deduced or inferred from them.

The law of parallelism which is now universally recognized was perhaps first mentioned in the Rabbinic literature of the Midrash Rabbah on Genesis and Canticles, but has not become known to modern scholarship before Lowth wrote, in 1753, his *De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum*. Only since Lowth may parallelism be said to have become so universally adopted. Parallelism is now perhaps the only law of Hebrew poetry on which there appears to be general agreement. No other law of form holds equal sway. Whether ancient Hebrew poetry also conformed to the law of metre has been much disputed, and for long there was also doubt as to what constituted the foot or the metrical unit. Latterly only has it become generally accepted, particularly among English scholars, that the beat of the accent is to be regarded as the unit of the metre. With these, and a few other simple laws succinctly described by G. R. Driver in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, one may at the present time justifiably ignore all the elaborate systems of metre that have been embodied in many ponderous volumes, and safely scan as well as understand many an ancient poem of the Hebrews, including even those which are embedded in the narrative portions of the Old Testament and bear the superficial appearance of prose.

III. It seems strange that with so much uncertainty as to what were the actual laws of the forms of ancient Hebrew verse, scholars should have ventured to alter the text of Scripture merely *metri causa*. Though it can now hardly be denied that the simple laws of form mentioned above were followed by the ancient Hebrew poets, it does not necessarily follow that any stichos, couplet, or triplet, which does not conform to these laws, must inevitably be the result of a corruption of the text. As will be shown below, irregularities of metre and

apparent textual corruptions disappear entirely as soon as the ancient form of arrangement and recital is recalled and applied.

Poems of the Old Testament were recorded sometimes in a longer, and sometimes in a shorter version. The longer version represented the full form of recital; the shorter, the same poem with the omission of repeated words, phrases, or entire clauses. That this was the case can be shown (a) from instances of two such versions, a longer and a shorter, occurring in the very text of the Old Testament; (b) from longer and shorter versions of the same poem occurring respectively in the Septuagint and the Massoretic Text; (c) from evidence of the Talmud, and (d) from the practice in the Synagogue Ritual which dates back to Temple times.¹

The prevalence of repetition in the poetry of the Bible has been overlooked for a long time, and some scholars were ready to emend the text whenever repeated matter made its appearance. It can be shown, however, that repetition is one of the main features of ancient Hebrew poetry as it was also a prevalent feature in the hymns and psalms of the Babylonians and the Egyptians.

IV. The ancient scribes of the East had also their *ditto* signs which were represented on the clay tablets of Babylon and other centres of ancient civilization by the sign of KIMIN or by blanks. Later copyists have often economized space, particularly in their precious vellum, by omitting the blanks or the sign of KIMIN and writing the matter consecutively, relying upon the reader to supply from memory the repeated words that were represented on the tablets by the blanks or KIMIN.

¹ Cf. my 'Stichometry and Text of the Great Hallel,' *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xxix. pp. 255-268. With regard to other points, briefly referred to in this paper, which might appear to be dogmatically stated, cf. my notes and articles in the following Journals: 'The Metre and Text of Psalm xxix. 3, 4, 9, and Ezekiel i. 21,' *ib.* vol. xxxi. pp. 186-189; 'The Metre and Text of Psalm xxvii.,' *ib.* pp. 387-395; 'Omnipresence, Omniscience, and Condescension in Psalm cxlii. 5-6,' *ib.* vol. xxxii. pp. 367-370; 'Song of Deborah,' *ib.* vol. xxxiii. pp. 341-354; 'The Text and the Ancient Form of Recital of Psalm xxiv. and Psalm cxxiv.,' *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. li. pp. 214-226; 'Typographic Arrangement of Ancient Hebrew Poetry,' *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, N.F., vol. viii. pp. 211-222, and 'Forms and Features of Ancient Hebrew Poetry,' in the *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, No. xvi. pp. 31-49. Cf. also my 'Gen. iv. 7 and a Form of Hebrew Poetry,' *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, vol. xxxviii. p. 329 f.

Marsatu Uruk marsatu Agade KI sunulak

Marsatu Uruk sunulak
Marsatu Agade KI

Nakhon libi Elohim ashirah wa'azamera

Nakhon libi Elohim

ashirah wa'azamera.

Lo khen haresha'im—

Οὐχ οὕτως οἱ ἀσεβεῖς, οὐχ οὕτως.

as an isolated stichos, though the previous four lines are arranged by him in couplets or distichs. He thus gets in the verses under discussion the following irregular metre: 4+4, 4+4, 4. Kittel has the same metrical arrangement as Gunkel, and is also left with an isolated tetrameter.

On the lines of our thesis we may obtain a perfectly regular metre without recourse to any conjectured emendation. All one has to do to obtain this regular metre and to avoid also an isolated stichos is to treat the difficult line as a

refrain which was repeated after every stichos and, in writing, appeared in the top line only, being represented by blanks (which equalled modern *ditto* signs) in the lines which followed it.

The original may have been arranged as follows :

First Voice.

How long, O Lord, wilt thou forget me for ever ?
How long wilt thou hide thy face from me ?
How long shall I take counsel in my soul ?
How long shall mine enemy be exalted over me ?

Second Voice.

Sorrow is in my heart all day.
do.
do.
do.

This reading clearly produces a regular 4+3 metre throughout the strophe ; and the assumption of antiphonal, recital, or chant obviously improves the sense. If we agree that 'and night' followed 'day,' as some scholars assume, we obtain a 4+4 metre, as suggested by Kittel and Gunkel, for example, and in addition we get rid of the isolated stichos which they have to admit. These satisfactory results, however, can also be obtained if it is assumed, as in view of our thesis seems quite likely, that 'how long' (*ad-anah*) was repeated also before *yagon* as the opening words of the refrain, thus :

Ad-anah yagon bilebhabhi yomam

'How long will sorrow be in my heart all day ?'

VII. Is 2^{12, 13} :

For the Lord of Hosts hath a day
Upon all that is proud and haughty,
And upon all that is lifted up, and it shall be brought low,
And upon all the cedars of Lebanon that are high and lifted up,
And upon all the oaks of Bashan.

G. B. Gray believes that a line is missing between 'and upon all that is lifted up, and it shall be brought low' and 'and upon all the cedars of Lebanon'; and, furthermore, that the words 'that are high and lifted up,' in v.¹³, are, with Stade and Marti, to be omitted. These words, in the opinion of Gray, 'are rhythmically redundant' and also 'weaken the sense,' since the cedars of Lebanon being the tallest of their kind need no qualifying epithet.

Budde also asserts that a stichos is missing, and that it may originally have appeared in combination with the irregular and broken line 'that are high and lifted up.'

Following the lines of our thesis we may rediscover the missing stichos without any violence

to the text, and at the same time remove the difficulty presented by the words 'that are high and lifted up' (HARAMIM WEHANISA'IM), which in the present arrangement of the text are indeed 'rhythmically redundant.'

Assumed Original Arrangement.

- (a) For the Lord of Hosts hath a day
- (b) Upon all that is proud and haughty ;
- (c) And upon all that is lifted up and . . .
- (d) And upon all the cedars of Lebanon,
- (e) " " " the high and uplifted,
- (f) And upon all the oaks of Bashan.

The Massoretic Text, which is roughly represented by the translation at the beginning of the section, is a copy of the above with the omission of the *ditto* signs which were represented by blanks in the ancient original.

The omission here in line (c) of 'and it shall be brought low,' which in the Authorized as well as the Revised Version is given as the equivalent of the single Hebrew word WESHAPHEL is intentional. The rendering of the English Versions is uncertain, and whether we follow the suggestion of Gray or G. H. Box, or that of any other scholar, the solution of the difficult stichos here suggested cannot in any way be affected.

It will be noted that (c) is parallel to (e), and (d) is parallel to (f)—an instance of alternate parallelism or chiasmus.

VIII. Jer 50³⁵⁻³⁸.

- (v.³⁵) A sword is upon the Chaldeans, saith the Lord, and upon the inhabitants (or burghers) of Babylon, and upon her princes and upon her wise men.
- (v.³⁶) A sword is upon the boastings (or babblers), and they shall dote : a sword is upon her mighty men, and they shall be dismayed.

(v.³⁷) A sword is upon their horses, and upon their chariots, and upon all the mingled people that are in the midst of her, and they shall become as women: a sword is upon her treasures, and they shall be robbed.

(v.³⁸) A drought is upon her waters, and they shall be dried up; for it is a land of graven images, and they are mad upon terrors.

C. H. Cornill rightly noted that 'the whole structure and plan of the passage rests upon the rhetorical figure of anaphora, to which this section is especially partial.' For this reason, however, he emends the reading of the first word of v.³⁸ from HoReBH (*a drought*) to HeReBH (*a sword*), which is the reading of the Peshitta. This emendation is also adopted by Duhm, Giesebrecht, and Volz.

The requirements of anaphora, however, it may be pointed out, will not be satisfied by this single change; nor does the passage, even after emendation, seem to agree with any metrical scheme, as the following instances show:—

(1) The words 'saith the Lord' in v.³⁵, for example, make the stichos too long, and are, as a fact, wanting in the Septuagint. If they are to be treated as a separate stichos, some additional word seems to be required to bring up the stichos to its proper length.

(2) While HeReBH (*a sword*) occurs at fairly regular intervals in v.³⁶ and in vv.^{37d. 38a} (assuming that the reading in v.³⁸ is also HeReBH), forming trimeter and tetrameter lines, the intervals in

vv.^{35. 37a. b. c} are most irregular, there being a distance of 7-11 stresses between one HeReBH and another. The inclusion of these varied measures in one passage can hardly produce a regular poem.

Volz also has recourse to emendation when he deletes 'upon their horses and upon their chariots' in v.³⁷, because, he says, the line is too long at the side of the other short stichoi, and, furthermore, because the expression 'and they shall become women' does not fit 'horses and chariots.'

The following omissions from the Septuagint are also significant: 'a sword is upon the boastings' is wanting from v.³⁶, 'all' is wanting from v.³⁷, and HRBH (*sword* or *drought*) is wanting from v.³⁸. On the first mentioned, Giesebrecht remarks that it has obviously fallen out, and the last, he states, is erroneously missing from the Septuagint. While these gaps in the Septuagint are a certainty, Giesebrecht's assertions do not satisfactorily explain how they originated. It must also be borne in mind that quite a number of Greek manuscripts read in v.³⁸, *machaira(n) epi to hudati aules*, *Μάχαρα(ν) ἐπὶ τῷ ὕδατι αὐλῆς*, *a sword upon her waters*.

We steer clear of all the difficulties mentioned if, on the lines of our thesis, we assume that the poem under consideration had a long form of recital which was recorded in shorter forms.

The original, of which the Massoretic Text may be a copy, might have been arranged as follows:

Assumed Form of the Original.

[The ditto signs equal the original blanks.]

First Voice.

Herebh al kasdim
 " neum Yaweh
 " el-yoshbhe babhel
 " el-sareha
 " el hakhameha
 Herebh el habbadim
 Herebh el gibboreha
 Herebh el susaw
 " el rikhbbo
 " el kol haerebh
 " " asher bethokhah
 Herebh el ozrotheha
 Herebh el memeha

Second Voice.

wenoalu
 wahathu

 wehayu lenashim
 ubhozazu
 WYBHSU

Refrain.

Ki erez pesilim hi
 Ubheemim yithhalalu.

Translation.[The *ditto* signs represent the original blanks.]*First Voice.*

A sword upon the Chaldeans,
 " " ! saith the Lord :
 " " upon the burghers of Babylon,
 " " upon her princes,
 " " upon her wise men ;
 A sword upon the babblers,
 A sword upon her mighty men,
 A sword upon their horses,
 " " upon their chariots,
 " " upon all that mingled people ;
 " " " " that are in the midst of her,
 A sword upon her treasures,
 A drought upon her waters,

Second Voice.

and they shall dote.
 and they shall be dismayed.
 and they shall become as women.
 and they shall be robbed.
 and they shall be dried up.

Refrain.

For a land of graven images it is,
 And upon terrors they are mad.

Two voices may have taken part in the recital. While the first voice recited a line from the left-hand column, the second voice responded with a line from the right-hand column. When the first voice recited, for example,

'A sword upon the Chaldeans,'

the second voice responded either (a) 'and they shall dote,' (b) 'and they shall be dismayed,' or (c) 'and they shall become as women.' When the first voice recited,

'A sword upon the burghers of Babylon,'

the second voice again responded with (a), (b), or (c). In other words, the right-hand column represents the responses of the choir or congregation—responses from which selections were made by the responding voice to harmonize with any particular line selected by the first voice from the left-hand column.

The response 'WYBHSU' could be made to harmonize with most of the lines by vocalizing it in the recitation as WeYeBHoSHU (*and they shall be ashamed or confounded*), and with line 13, 'a drought upon her waters,' by vocalizing it in the recitation as WeYaBHeSHU (*and they shall be dried up*). So also the word HRBH could be read either HeReBH or HoReBH to suit the particular context, according to the desire of the respective readers or choirs that took part in the recital or chant.

This assumption will also remove the necessity of asserting, with Cornill, that the punctuation of the Massoretic Text is due to 'prosaic consideration of reasonableness.'

Likewise it may have been left to the singers to select the preposition AL, *upon*, or EL, *to*. Hence the five times AL in the Septuagint where the Massoretic Text has EL. Hence also AL in v.³⁵, EL in the other verses of the Massoretic Text itself.

The refrain may have been recited several times at suitable intervals in the poem.

The omissions in the Septuagint merely help to preserve one of the various forms of recital, while the Massoretic Text is the result of copying the original form, as represented here, line after line omitting the blanks.

It is no more necessary, accordingly, to assume with Volz that, 'upon their horses and upon their chariots' is probably an erroneous intrusion from the similar passage in 51²¹. These seven words (four in Hebrew), as has been shown, belong to two consecutive stichoi; and the expression 'and they shall become as women' does not form the response to either of them.

The measure of the poem is clearly regular, the stichoi having formed tetrameters or pentameters according as the second voice preferred the use of one or other of the responses. That the 'rhetorical figure of anaphora, to which this section is especially partial,' as Cornill pointed out, reappears in its full strength—need hardly be pointed out.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

It is characteristic of the advance made during the twentieth century in Old Testament studies, that a good deal of attention has been paid to the pre-exilic cultus of Israel. As they stand, the prescriptions contained in the Law, though certainly containing much that is early, are post-exilic. But what were the ritual and the ceremonial which the prophets so vigorously condemned? The autumnal Feast of Tabernacles, the greatest and most solemn occasion in the calendar of agricultural religion, has been fully investigated; scholars like Gunkel and Mowinckel on the Continent, and the authors of 'Myth and Ritual' (or some of them) in Great Britain, have helped to reconstruct the actual process of the cultus, though it must be admitted that many features still remain conjectural. In Band lii. Heft 3 of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Töpelmann, Giessen) Professor Pedersen of Copenhagen inaugurates similar study of the Passover. Pedersen is one of the most brilliant and attractive of living Old Testament scholars, and, though we may not agree with all his conclusions, we cannot but be impressed by the way in which he builds up a ritual for the Passover, and reconstructs details. Another long and important article is a study of the Levitical traditions in the Old Testament by K. Möhlenbrink. He distinguishes four types of material: (a) Genealogical lists, which he treats much as Rothstein and Hänel have done in dealing with 1 Chronicles; (b) narratives about Levites, individuals and groups both being concerned; (c) statements of the Levitical duties; and (d) poetic sections such as appear in Gn 49, Dt 33, and the Korahite psalms. Möhlenbrink freely acknowledges his debt to Alt and Noth, but advances beyond them, and his work may prove to be a useful basis for further studies. Professor Robertson of Manchester analyses Is 1 with care and thoroughness, though not all of his conclusions will find general acceptance. For instance, he regards vv.²⁻⁷ as a single piece, in spite of the very marked break in sense and metre at the end of v.³. A short article of great importance in a limited sphere is Möhle's account of a number of newly discovered readings taken from the later Greek versions of the Old Testament—Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. Short notes are contributed by

Professor Thomas of Durham and J. R. Coates of Birmingham. A valuable feature of this, as of most other issues of the *Zeitschrift*, is a short sketch of the more important work done in Old Testament studies during the last few months. This is the work of the Editor, Professor Hempel of Göttingen.

Almost the whole of the latest number of this journal (Band lii. Heft 4) is devoted to textual criticism. Of all branches of the technical study of the Old Testament it is textual criticism which demands the most accurate expert knowledge and makes the least appeal to the lay reader. Yet the work has to be done, for we cannot well discuss the meaning or origin of a document unless we know what it actually contains. The distinguished Swedish scholar, Nyberg, prints a paper which he read before the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft last autumn, dealing with the text of Hosea, and pleading for a far more conservative treatment than this book normally receives. The editor gives us a careful and scientific account of a number of passages in which a 'variant' reading in the Samaritan Pentateuch is really supported by Massoretic evidence. He also contributes notes to an article by one of his own pupils, E. Henschke, containing conjectural emendations on Dt 32. Even the 'Mitteilungen' are mainly occupied with a debate on the text of Lamentations, and there is a pathetic interest attaching to this section, inasmuch as it contains the last words that Karl Budde penned on a technical subject. A. Schulz discusses the very obscure phrase at the end of Gn 15². He eliminates the name of Eliezer from the text altogether, substituting a phrase meaning 'is not my seed'—'and the son of my steward is not my own child,' and regarding Damascus as an Aramaic gloss. In fact, the only article which does not deal with textual criticism is by Alt, who offers an acute discussion on the formula for the Lex Talionis, especially in the light of a North African inscription. While much of this will have little interest for the general reader, the issue includes a summary of all the important articles dealing with the Old Testament and kindred subjects during recent months. It is impossible for any one to follow all the necessary journals, and it is by no means the smallest service which the *Z.A.W.* is rendering to us that it tells us what is being done. It is this feature, more than any other, which makes the

periodical absolutely indispensable to every one who wishes to keep abreast of the progress being made in Old Testament studies.

THEODORE H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

Professor Westin of Uppsala has made a special study of the efforts to achieve church union in the seventeenth century, and published a couple of years ago in English some of the results of his researches under the title 'Negotiations about Church Unity, 1628-1634.' This new volume¹ is devoted specially to the heroic efforts of a distinguished Scottish divine, John Durie, to bring about union among the divided Protestant churches of Europe. Durie sprang from a family that gave leaders to both sides of the Reformation struggle in Scotland. He was born in Edinburgh, and studied in Oxford, and received his first ministerial appointment as pastor of the English and Scottish refugees in Elbing in Germany. Coming into contact with both Lutherans and Calvinists, he was grieved at the bitter discord that existed between those who should have been united against the common Roman foe, and resolved to devote his life to the task of bringing them together. It is to the record of Durie's patient, painstaking, prolonged efforts to attain this object that Professor Westin devotes this book. The author spared no pains to make his story complete. Letters from Durie to leaders in Church and State in different countries and from them to him survive in many libraries on the Continent and in Britain, and these Dr. Westin has discovered and studied, and from the information thus obtained he has written this important history of Durie's earnest, but frustrated attempts to heal the divisions of Protestantism.

Durie had evident qualifications for the task

¹ Gunnar Westin, *Svenska Kyrkan och de protestantiska enhetssträvandena under 1630-talet* (Lund: Lundska Bokhandeln, Uppsala).

he had undertaken. He had marked abilities and competent theological scholarship, which led to his being appointed one of the divines to whom we owe the Westminster Confession and Catechisms. He had an unquenchable love of peace, unwearied patience in pursuing the object he had chosen, reluctance to take offence, an optimism that rose above all defeats and rebuffs, and a charm of character that attracted men of divergent views and doctrines. During a residence in Holland he had come into contact with Dutch Calvinists and Huguenots, and had seen the evil consequences of religious discord, and came to dislike intensely strict, minute confessions and rigid ecclesiastical ordinances. Throughout his long life he adhered to the principle that Protestants should unite on a brief creed containing only what was really fundamental, and should co-operate in the tasks of practical Christian life, and he showed himself ready to work with any and every form of Protestant creed. But this standpoint was looked on as sinful latitudinarianism by Lutheran and Calvinist alike. There is not space in a brief review to follow Professor Westin's narrative of Durie's work in various countries, especially in Sweden. In the end they were completely baffled by the dogged determination of the theologians to stand by their differences and abate no jot of their conviction of the infallibility of their doctrines. The consequences were disastrous. A divided Protestantism was unable to resist as fully as it might have done the opposition of Rome and ran a serious danger of being extinguished. The Protestant world had to wait for nearly three centuries before the work attempted by Durie was taken up by the late Archbishop Söderblom in what is now known as the Stockholm Movement on the lines laid down by Durie. Scotsmen may be proud that that work was anticipated in the seventeenth century by one of their fellow-countrymen. It would be well if Professor Westin's book could appear in an English dress.

JOHN A. BAIN.

Belfast.

Contributions and Comments.

The Third Gospel: A Hidden Source.

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June 1935, p. 428, the note by the Rev. W. J. Fournier, B.D. (on my

article of April 1935), misses the real point. Though it quotes the central phrase, 'a gospel source among the Pharisees,' it fails to realize the significance of the words. Mr. Fournier confines his attention to the minor point contained in my footnote—

suggesting a possible identification of the 'parchments' of 2 Ti 4¹³. Almost every conceivable theory has been advanced (including one, I understand, which identifies the 'cloak' with an ecclesiastical vestment!). Particulars will be found in any good commentary or introduction. But it would be a pity if these peripheral matters were to distract attention from the central thesis.

E. P. DICKIE.

Edinburgh.

'Ye are the salt of the earth' (Matt. v. 13).

THE contribution in the July number by Mr. A. J. Mee in regard to salt which has lost its savour, while most interesting, does not seem to be quite convincing. A little quantity of salt in an oven which requires renewing only about every fifteen years would hardly be noticeable when thrown out whether on the street or on the land. Surely a more reasonable and quite sufficient explanation of our Lord's reference to the salt is that given by Dr. Thomson in *The Land and the Book*. It may be of interest to quote from it as that admirable work is not now readily accessible. 'It is plainly implied that salt, under certain conditions so generally known as to permit our Lord to found His instruction upon them, did actually lose its saltiness, and our only business is to discover these conditions, not to question their existence. Nor is this difficult. I have often seen just such salt, and the identical disposition of it that our Lord has mentioned. . . . It should be stated, in this connexion, that the salt used in this country is not manufactured by boiling clean salt water, nor quarried from mines, but is obtained from marshes along the seashore, as in Cyprus, or from salt lakes in the interior, which dry up in summer, as the one in the desert north of Palmyra. . . . I have seen these marshes covered with a thick crust of salt, and have also visited them when it had been gathered into heaps like haycocks in a meadow.'

Mandrell, who visited the lake at Jebbûl, tells us that he had found salt there which had entirely 'lost its savour,' and the same abounds among the debris at Usdum, and in other localities of rock-salt at the south end of the Dead Sea. Indeed, it is a well-known fact that the salt of this country, when in contact with the ground, or exposed to rain or sun, does become insipid and useless. From the manner in which it is gathered, much

earth and other impurities are necessarily collected with it. Not a little of it is so impure that it cannot be used at all; and such salt soon effloresces and turns to dust—not to fruitful soil, however. It is not only good for nothing itself, but it actually destroys all fertility wherever it is thrown; and this is the reason why it is cast into the street. There is a sort of verbal verisimilitude in the manner in which our Lord alludes to the act—'it is cast out' and 'trodden under foot'; so troublesome is this corrupted salt, that it is carefully swept up, carried forth, and thrown into the street. There is no place about the house, yard, or garden where it can be tolerated. No man will allow it to be thrown on to his field, and the only place for it is the street; and there it is cast, to be trodden under foot of men.

J. H. MORRISON.

Aberdeen.

The Prayer of St. Chrysostom.

IN reference to the note of Mr. Purchase (in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May, p. 379), surely it is the very pedantry of accuracy that would call the phrase in the Prayer of St. Chrysostom a 'misquotation.'

In our Lord's saying (in Mt 18^{19, 20}), the second part, '*for where two or three are gathered . . . there am I . . .*' is essential to, and gives the condition for, the promise in the first part, '*if two of you shall agree . . . it shall be done. . .*'—as is shown by the word '*for*'; and the intimate inter-connexion of the two parts seems quite to justify the language of the Prayer.

H. E. WHATELY.

London.

The Strange Word 'Propitiation.'

THERE are few words which have fallen more out of use in modern preaching than 'propitiation.' This is due partly to its difficulty of meaning and partly because of distaste to the popular associations of the word. It is well to re-examine the sources for ourselves.

The word so translated does not in the New Testament mean our customary or current sense of it, but rather the agent or means of reconciliation. It is true that in primitive days confused ideas of God and His character begot the idea of men

placating an offended and menacing divinity, but in the Old Testament this primitive idea has almost disappeared. It peers out two or three times, it is true, but in the Old Testament 'propitiation' means, in general, just somehow establishing or restoring good relations.

Let us gather together the texts in the New Testament that shed light upon the meaning:

ἱλαστήριον is used twice in the New Testament, in Ro 3²⁵, 'Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation (or means of propitiation, or propitiatory) through faith in his blood'; in He 9⁵, the covering of the ark or *mercy seat*, sprinkled with the atoning blood, i.e. the blood of reconciliation, of life shared in unity, on the Day of Atonement.

ἱλασμός appears in 1 Jn 2², 'And he is the propitiation for our sins,' and in 1 Jn 4¹⁰, 'Herein is love . . . that . . . he sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.'

ἰάσθητι is found in Lk 18¹³, 'God be merciful to me, a sinner.'

ἰάσκεσθαι in He 2¹⁷, 'a merciful . . . high priest . . . to make reconciliation' (or propitiation) or to procure forgiveness 'for the sins of the people.'

ἰλέως, Mt 16²², 'Peter . . . be it far from thee, Lord' (God have mercy on thee), and in He 8¹², 'For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness.'

Of these quotations the strictly relevant to the argument are Ro 3²⁵, 1 Jn 2², 1 Jn 4¹⁰. It is to be noted that none of the early Reformed versions uses 'propitiation.' It crept in through the Vulgate, by way of Rheims. Tyndale, the Geneva Bible, Cranmer, use other words. Trench¹ thinks the word did not then exist. They use, e.g., 'to make agreement,' 'he that obtaineth grace,' or (for Ro 3²⁵) 'the obtainer of mercy,' or 'a pacification.' 'Propitiation,' the use of which is still in some circles regarded as a mark of orthodoxy, must at one time, like everything else, including Foreign Missions and Sunday schools and translations of the Bible, have been a 'dangerous innovation.'

Note, in all these eight instances of the word and its derivatives, that: (1) if any agent is mentioned, it is God. Propitiation is never an act of human beings any more than divine forgiveness is. (2) God is never object of the action. (3) There is no object of the action stated as being propitiated. (4) The conception in every case is primarily that of mercy. (5) When Christ is spoken of as the propitiation it is consistent with this—He is God's mercy, His reconciling mercy, whose presence sin has necessitated—sin in relation to God's love.

(6) The propitiation is a place of mercy, where God and sinner meet through the life that has won the sinner and, in winning him, has changed his inner life; has cleansed him by revealing God's redemptive love. And that place is a Person—Jesus Christ—and, supremely, Christ on the Cross. (7) This is God's action, not ours, and through God's messenger not ours: holy love is His motive; our sins the cause.

'The key is in that word: Christ Jesus whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood. It is not a device but a direct effective action. Thus nobly does Paul invert the pagan idea of a propitiation offered to God.'² Reconciliation has been achieved for us by God in Christ; but it is for me ineffective until I realize it in my life. Yet the sure emphasis on this act of God is not necessarily bound up in this way with the direction of the 'propitiation' to a person. It is true that Sanday and Headlam³ decide that some one must be propitiated, and that some one must be God. But with profound respect, does not that involve a wrong use of the word, a use primitive, but not Christian? The New Testament, at least, never actually says so. And may it not be possible, if the word is to be understood as requiring an object, if it must be used transitively (which seems doubtful), that it is the hard damning fact of things as they are that is to be met by the propitiatory mercy?

The meaning suggested here is borne out by the evidence of the papyri, which show from the habit of the word in New Testament times that it was not used to denote a placatory offering to a person, turning away wrath.⁴

Sin is cancelled by God as a finally effective factor in man's life. It is done through Jesus Christ. Sin otherwise brings its own inevitable reward. The wages of sin is death. Its ravages cannot be met or answered by ignoring it, but only by providing the means of overcoming it, of breaking its power as the final factor and giving man liberty of choice. Christ, in whom man sees God coming to him in forgiveness, and in whom he learns to know God as holy love, is the means. Christ is the loving-kindness where sin is reckoned with (not eluded), and that through reconciliation.

He is thus the propitiation for sin, is a sacrifice to the hard fact of it. Or, to put it otherwise, the Incarnation, and, supremely, its ultimate expression,

² Cf. F. D. Maurice, *The Doctrine of Sacrifice*.

³ *Epistle to the Romans* (I.C.C.), 90.

⁴ Cf. C. M. Cobern, *The New Archaeological Discoveries*, 34.

¹ *Synonyms of the New Testament*, 276.

is the step taken and shared in by God in order to convey such a message to the whole moral personality of man as shall break the power of sin and make him a son of God.

He breaks the power of cancelled sin,
He sets the prisoner free.

For it is sin He comes to free us from. Successive generations are always trying to edge away from this under the guise of cultural advance. There is no need—quite the contrary—to apply old terms, themselves but temporary methods of expressing some of the eternal truths of Scripture, or to insist in reproductions of the past in experience; but this fact is so. It is sin He comes to free us from. Hellenizing theologians may protest, as they did in Origen's time, that this sort of thing is for the common herd, that what is needed is a knowledge of the world, the capacity to handle life competently; and that the wise man needs no Saviour. So talk the wise and prudent, delicately appreciative of the greatness of Christ. To such, mercy and forgive-

ness are meaningless, for love means to God only what they choose to read into it.

To faith, the love of God has declared itself with passion to be active, initiatory, personal, in sorrow speaking the clinching and ultimate word in Christ.

Jesus Christ is the means, the power, the life by which this love reaches us. He Himself is this Goodness. He is the Mercy in whom God and man meet. This is, as we suggest, as near to the meaning of propitiation as we can get. The difficulty is, as we have seen, that one would think one must have somebody who is propitiated, but nowhere in the New Testament is there any word of propitiating God. And as it is, the phrase is so incurably associated with ideas utterly alien to the New Testament, with the image of a placatory attitude to an offended mighty one, that religion might be well rid of it for a while. There is One who Himself is Mercy and in Christ we have found Him.

INNES LOGAN.

Edinburgh.

Entre Nous.

Louisa Alcott.

The author of 'Little Women,' who was born on the 29th of November 1832, and died when she was not much more than middle-aged, worn out by the earlier struggles of their family life, is still a figure full of interest not only in America, but in England. Miss Meigs' biography, written specially for young folk, won the Newbery Medal for 1934, and will make the fortunes of the Alcott family better known among the new generation—*The Story of Louisa Alcott* (Harrap; 8s. 6d. net).

The Alcotts were a devoted family—Louisa had a little prayer which she said to herself many times, 'God help us all and keep us for one another.'

The father, Bronson Alcott, had only the slightest of educations, but he was a born teacher and had enlightened views on education. He had the good fortune to come in contact with a Quaker, Reuben Haines, who founded and supported a school at Germantown, near Philadelphia, and put Bronson Alcott in charge. Here Abba May, the daughter of Colonel Joseph May, and he made their first home, and here the oldest two children, Anna and

Louisa, were born. But with the death of Reuben Haines it was not found possible to carry on the school, and the family moved to Boston. It was the first of the twenty-nine moves that were to be made before Louisa was twenty-eight. At Boston there was a time of success. Bronson was head of the Temple School, and had Elizabeth Peabody of Kindergarten fame as his assistant. But he was a firm abolitionist and close friend of William Lloyd Garrison, and gradually opposition grew stronger and was brought to a head when there was included among the pupils a little coloured girl. Numbers dwindled, and finally, when Bronson Alcott remained deaf 'to all protests, still insisting that his school must be open to all children alike, the parents, one by one, visited the school one day and removed their children.'

The next move was to Hosmer Cottage at Concord, where Louisa had 'a vague impression of Mr. Emerson's presiding over the enterprise as its patron and guiding saint.' There they lived even more simply than before, and Bronson Alcott 'worked hard at anything he could find to do. He toiled at farm labour, at gardening, and at

wood-chopping.' They were entirely other-worldly. 'One of their friends, coming to stay for a visit, observed that their extremely plain and meagre meals were reduced from three a day to two, since they were carrying the third daily to a family in great need' (p. 41). It was difficult for little Louisa to understand that this was not usual behaviour, and we find her in trouble because when on a visit she raided the larder of the house in order to feed a family of dirty children. 'Poor little Louisa! She had not the faintest idea that in "feeding the poor" she was doing other than what was right. They always fed the poor at her house, no matter how little there was with which to feed anybody.'

There followed another experiment—this time in community life after the model of the Shakers. At the end they had to confess 'our way has gone wrong.' For a time Mrs. Alcott kept boarders, Anna and Louisa taught, Elizabeth helped with the housework, while May the youngest was still at school, and Bronson Alcott tried a lecturing tour in the West. He came back with one dollar. "Another year I shall do better," he observed cheerfully. There was a minute of choking silence. "I call that doing *very well*," said Abba Alcott suddenly, as she threw her arms about his neck.

'Little Women' was not written until Louisa Alcott was thirty-six—persuaded by the publisher, Thomas Niles, who tried to turn her from other lines that she had been trying to what he felt she had a genius for, stories for girls. Its success was so great that the lean days were over for the Alcott family.

Interesting figures move through the biography—chiefly Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry Thoreau, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Theodore Parker, the preacher who encouraged Louisa in the early days of struggle. 'He is like a great fire where all can come and be warmed and comforted,' she said. She loved Nature, and got from it, too, an understanding of God. When only a child she went out one morning to watch the day break. 'The maples were scarlet and the birch trees gold, all about her; the morning was absolutely still, there was a thin mist over the low meadows beyond which the sun was coming up. It was a moment of such complete and unbelievable beauty that it made her suddenly feel that she was transformed into a different person. She said afterwards that she never understood God so fully as she did at that second, and that she understood Him for ever after, from having realized, all at once, the beauty of the world which He had given her to dwell in.

She went home with something new in her heart which she was never to lose.'

Giving.

'There was one night when a windy snow was flying about the little house and the cold was creeping in at every draughty crack. There was practically no wood in the shed, and Abba was frantic. Suddenly, quite unannounced, a load of wood arrived, sent by a kindly neighbour out of his own store, got from his own wood-lot, perhaps even cut by Bronson himself. The Alcotts' friends had all been anxious over the state of affairs at the Hosmer Cottage (at Concord) and each wanted to do something to help. Later in the evening, with cold and dark and wind still surrounding them, Bronson came in, smiling delightedly. A very poor man had just come to him, telling of a cold house, a sick baby, and an empty shed with no fuel. It was so fortunate that they had wood to give him, Bronson told his wife. He had let the poor fellow take all that he needed and had helped him to wheel it home.

'But what of his own family? Abba returned, hotly this time, for, in spite of her unflinching affection, she was not possessed of inexhaustible patience. The Alcotts had a baby too, she reminded him; it was just as cold in their house and would be dangerously so before morning. Her reproaches were interrupted by a knock at the door. A second neighbour, not knowing what the first had done, had also sent them a load of wood. The fire was piled high again, and warmth and cheerfulness filled the house once more.

"I told you that we would not suffer," Bronson reminded Abba. It was his sure belief that God would always provide for those who loved Him. Abba believed it also, with a difference. She thought that God expected people to help themselves as far as they could and not to lay the whole burden upon Him. Through all their lives, Anna and her father tended to accept the first, trusting belief; Louisa and her mother the greater responsibility of the second. It made no rift between them, but it shaped their destinies to the end.¹

¹ Cornelia Meigs, *The Story of Louisa Alcott*, 47.